DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 523 RC 018 537

TITLE	Indian Nations At Risk Task Force Business Meetings, 1990-91.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Indian Nations At Risk Task Force.
PUB DATE	Jun 91
NOTE	192p.; Indian Nations At Risk Task Force business meetings held in Washington, DC (May 14-16, 1990); Juneau, AK (July 1-18, 1990); San Diego, CA (October 17, 1990); Palo Alto, CA (February 12-14, 1991); and Washington, DC (June 10-11, 1991). For related documents, see ED 339 587-588 and RC 018 538-557.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indian Education; American Indians; Data Collection; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Indian Relationship; *Government Role; Higher Education; Meetings; Tribes
IDENTIFIERS	*Indian Nations At Risk Task Force; Task Force Approach

ABSTRACT

This document contains detailed reports of the five business meetings held by the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force during 1990-91. At the initial meeting, Task Force members and interested parties clarified the goals and guiding principles of the Task Force's work. This work would include gathering data on the educational status of Indian children, youth, and adults; finding and publicizing programs that work; identifying misconceptions about Indian education; and recommending ways to improve education for Native Americans. Possible topics for exploration were discussed, particularly Native American education goals and their relevance to national education goals. At subsequent meetings, wide-ranging discussions covered such topics as parent involvement; racial bias; special education; deficiencies in federal funding; the need for expanded state government involvement; major problems at Bureau of Indian Affairs schools; educational responsibility and role of governments, tribes, and Native people; educational finance issues related to improving Native education; alternative certification for Native teachers; task force efforts to make a political impact; the nature of the Federal Government-Indian relationship; and higher education issues. Recommendations for the Task Force's final report were formulated and amended for numerous "partners" concerned with the education of Native American children and adults: parents, educators, tribal governments and Native communities, local and state governments, the Federal Government, and colleges and universities. The greatest number of recommendations were directed to the Federal Government and included the following: (1) establish an Assistant Secretary for Indian Education in the U.S. Department of Education; (2) authorize the establishment of a national research and school improvement center for Native education; (3) amend the Bilingual Education Act to allow for the retention and continued development of Native languages in accordance with the Native American Language Act of 1990; and (4) promote as a national priority the training of Native professionals and Native educators for all levels of teaching. (SV)

ED341523

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Business Meetings

1990-91

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

RC 018537

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Initial Business Meeting: May 14-16, 1990

Washington, DC

The initial meeting of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force was held at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C. It was chaired by Co-chair William G. Demmert, Jr. Members present included David L. Beaulieu, Joseph H. Ely, Byron Fullerton, Norbert S. Hill, Jr., Bob G. Martin, Janine Pease-Windy Boy, Wilma J. Robinson, Ivan L. Sidney, Robert J. Swan, Eddie L. Tullis, and L. Lamar White. Not in attendance were Co-chair Terrel H. Bell, Hayes A. Lewis, and Robert Coles.

Monday, May 14, 1990 - Preliminary Session

Ann Bailey, Committee Management Operations, Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs briefed the Task Force on the history and role of task forces in government and highlighted basic committee management requirements which include establishment of a charter, advance notices of meetings in the *Federal Register*, the need for a quorum to be present for full task force and subcommittee meetings, rules governing open and closed meetings, and reporting requirements (minutes of meetings and an annual report). Joan Bardee, Office of General Counsel, was then introduced to provide members with a briefing on legal restrictions, ethics, and potential conflict of interest issues which they might encounter during their tenure on the Task Force.

Welcome and Introductions

The official meeting was convened at 10:00 am by Task Force Executive Director Alan Ginsburg, who indicated that he would turn the chair over to Dr. Demmert as soon as Task Force members were officially sworn in. After introductions, Dr. Ginsburg explained that Secretary Cavazos had asked the Department of Education's Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation to provide staff support and coordination for the Task Force. Identification of issues, establishment of goals, decisions, and recommendations will be the responsibility of the Task Force.

Members were provided with briefing books that included the agenda, organizational information, and working documents as well as summaries of studies and available data indicators regarding the status of Indian education. Members were also provided with copies of a recently published ED document entitled "Better Schooling for Children of Poverty: Alternatives to Conventional Wisdom."

It was noted that Co-chair Secretary Bell would not be attending this first meeting due to an unavoidable schedule conflict, but that he would be in touch during the next two days and would attend subsequent meetings.

The agenda was reviewed, and Dr. Ginsburg noted that it would be flexible with the exception of scheduled public hearings during the first afternoon. Little public testimony is anticipated at this meeting; however, significant testimony will be expected during subsequent regional hearings.

NACIE Overview and Concerns

Ms. JoJo Hunt, Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE), then welcomed the Task Force on behalf of her organization and noted that NACIE Chairman Eddie L. Tullis was seated as a Task Force member. She also introduced two visitors from Western Australia: Oreil Joy Green, Acting Chairperson of the Aboriginal Education Consultative Group; and Isabelle Margaret Proctor, Superintendent of Education for the Western Australian Ministry of Education. Both women are recipients of Aboriginal Overseas Study Grants and are in Washington as a first stop during their trip to study education of indigenous peoples.

Ms. Hunt provided members with an overview of the history, membership, and mandate of NACIE. She stressed that the Council views its mandate "to advise and/or recommend on federal education programs in which Indians participate or from which they can benefit" in broad terms that range from early childhood to postsecondary education and encompass programs in any department of the federal government.

Ms. Hunt raised several issues of concern to her Council which she suggested should be viewed as a context for her further remarks: (1) NACIE, as a presidentially-appointed advisory body, has had difficulty being included as a part of any team effort by the Administration to improve Indian education. (2) The proposed White House Conference on Indian Education is intended to explore the feasibility of establishing an independent Board of Indian Education. (3) The Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Indian Affairs is planning to hold hearings on Indian education in 11 cities on May 24-25, 1990. (4) The Indian Nations at Risk Task Force is beginning, with this meeting, to hold hearings and embark on its own efforts to advise and make recommendations to the Secretary of Education. Ms. Hunt pointed out that this "flurry of uncoordinated activities" may be confusing and that coordination and information sharing among the various groups will be essential to avoid duplication of effort and an unfair burden to Indian tribes, Alaskan Native villages, and organizations that would want to attend and testify. She also noted that there already exists a vast amount of written and published testimony on Indian education which should be considered by the Task Force. She offered to provide documentation of hearings and issues sessions that NACIE gathered in its January and October 1989 meetings.

With reference to the work of the Task Force, Ms. Hunt recommended that they concentrate on the following goals:

(1) DATA - That available data on Indian education be gathered from all potential government sources for each of the last 10 years and that mechanisms be devised for routine reporting of data in the future

(2) DATA - That the Task Force work with NACIE, the Office of Indian Education, and others to determine achievement data needed to assess the impact of federal funds on Indian education; and that grantees be required to collect and report such data

(3) HEARINGS - That existing literature documenting previous hearings be categorized and analyzed with regard to recommendations and that additional hearings be held in conjunction with scheduled meetings of Indian organizations or other government hearings

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS - That Task Force recommendations be submitted to both the Secretary of Education and the White House Conference so that efforts are not duplicated

Ms. Hunt indicated that NACIE and its staff would stand ready to assist in the work of the Task Force, share any information they have which might be useful, and cooperate in any joint hearings, issues sessions, or discussions.

Finally, Ms. Hunt shared with the Task Force a concern expressed by Council members and other Indian people about the possibility that Task Force funds might come from Office of Indian Education salaries and expense monies that could have been reprogrammed into fellowships and grants.[1]

Installation of Members

Charles E.M. Kolb, Deputy Under Secretary, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation introduced Secretary Cavazos, pointing out that no person, with the exception of the President, was more committed to improving education especially in areas that clearly reflect the nation's education deficit. Efforts to accomplish improvement and address these deficits include the Secretary's call for the establishment of national goals with measurable outcomes and for educational reform and restructuring.

Secretary Cavazos began by officially swearing in the members of the Task Force and thanking them for their willingness to participate. In addressing the Task Force, Dr. Cavazos noted that the effort being asked of them was very difficult. To determine solutions, we must address the educational deficits of this population so that all Americans can be educated to their fullest potential. The Secretary recognized the need for this Task Force following his personal visit to a number of reservations. Of all ethnic groups in the country, Native American students have the highest dropout rate. The work of the Task Force must include:

(1) Gathering data from various agencies to determine more concretely the educational status of Indian children, youth, and adults

(2) Finding programs that work and getting the word out

(3) Identifying and clarifying misconceptions regarding Indian education

(4) Recommending ways to improve education for Native Americans

According to Dr. Cavazos, the work of the Task Force is part of the national education restructuring strategy. As such, he hopes that members will keep reviewing the national education goals jointly agreed upon by the President and the Governors as a guide for their efforts. The action must work toward goals that, by the year 2000:

(1) Every child will start school ready to learn.

(2) The graduation rate will increase to 90 percent nationally.

(3) All students will master the basic subject areas at all grade levels.

(4) Our country will be preeminent in math and science.

(5) All adults will be literate.

(6) All schools will be free of drugs and provide an environment that is safe for learning.

---

[1] It was subsequently confirmed through the Budget Service that such reprogramming could not have occurred without going back to Congress.

Are these goals realistic? If we continue on our present course, the answer is "no." However, if we completely restructure education and devise ways to serve previously underserved groups, the answer can be "yes."

Dr. Cavazos feels it is very important that parents, the business community, and state and federal officials--all involved parties--be brought into the loop as the Task Force pursues its mission. He also envisions their work as a key piece in helping to plan for the White House Conference on Indian Education. The President's commitment is deep and strong in this area, and Dr. Cavazos promises to keep him informed as the Task Force progresses. He thanked the members for their shared commitment and offered to make himself available to answer questions or discuss issues as needed. The Secretary then presented each member with a certificate of Task Force membership.

Discussion of Guiding Principles

At this point Co-chair Bill Demmert assumed leadership of the meeting.

Dr. Demmert reported that in his preliminary discussions with Co-chair Terrel Bell, they had agreed that the Task Force should work to prepare a "short, highly-charged report that everyone will read." They also felt that members of the Task Force ought to be able to reach consensus as a group on every point. The purposes of this first meeting are to focus on Task Force responsibilities, take a close look at the organization and structure of the report they will prepare, and discuss future Task Force meetings and hearings. The Task Force will need to work closely with NACIE to coordinate efforts. It will also be important to interact with other national, regional, and tribal groups as they proceed. In addition, the Task Force will need to closely consider the national education goals as it deliberates and see that they are addressed as it reviews and recommends ways to improve Indian education. Finally, the report that is to be produced should be a support for the White House Conference.

Members were referred to their briefing books for discussion of the working document entitled "Guiding Principles." The document alluded to A Nation At Risk and the potential continuity between that report of eight years ago and what may come from this committee. After walking through the five principles, Task Force members raised various issues of concern regarding the language of the principles.

- United States responsibility ...

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the first statement's reference to the U.S. Government's responsibility "in preserving the unique cultures of the Native American" should be broadened to include tribal governments that shared in this responsibility. Mr. Ely suggested that the government and the tribes share the responsibility. Mr. Sidney asked that the concept of "protecting" be added to "preserving." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that as long as the statement is not made "paternalistically," it represents both a major step away from the old notion of assimilation of tribal culture and also the hope that resources will be provided to the tribes to help them in this effort. After further discussion, it was agreed that the statement should indicate a government responsibility "to assist tribes" in "preserving and protecting" the native cultures.

Mr. Sidney asked if the Task Force was going to use "Native Americans" or "American Indians and Alaskan Natives." Mr. Hill suggested the use of "Indian Nations" rather than "Tribes." Dr. Demmert acknowledged the difficulty in deciding on these terms and suggested that the group return to this issue at a later point.

- Educational reform ...

In reference to the national education goals as a means of setting targets and holding schools accountable, Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that the issue of reform needed to be addressed differently in regard to Indian nations, because so many key elements have not yet been formed or provided. Reform looks at what exists and determines changes. We need to have a sense of the formative nature of Indian education--it can't be reformed if it isn't there. Dr. Beaulieu added that the past 20 years have been filled with good ideas, so the questions is: "Why don't these ideas work?" There is a need to look at the context to find the answer. Mr. Hill asked that they consider what they are trying to fix and the possibility of cultural clash. You can't install Boston school reform on the Hopi reservation.

Dr. Demmert agreed with the importance of looking at what isn't happening and distinguishing between instituting "new" programs versus reforming existing ones and also noted the need to make broad statements that would allow for more specificity at the local level. Mr. Hill added that his organization had conducted seven hearings across the country and found more agreement than differences among various tribes. Indian people basically "want their kids to land on their moccasins, not their Guccis, when they fall out of the educational pipeline."

It was generally agreed that the notion of "strategies" should be added to educational reform.

- Enriching curricula ...

With respect to the need for high expectations, Mr. Fullerton wondered about a possible conflict between maintaining Native American cultures when students are instilled with high expectations of success. Are these expectations defeated when young people choose to stay on the reservation? Dr. Demmert responded that reservations and Indian communities throughout Indian country need to be self-sufficient and they aren't. Self-sufficiency means varying things in terms of professions, services, and businesses. Sometimes achieving success means moving to new locations, but if we've done our job right in terms of building self-esteem and pride in culture, we can sensitize young people to considering both possibilities. Mr. Ely asked how one could inspire capitalistic goals in a socialistic environment such as the one that exists on many reservations. Kids know that they will not starve on the reservation, so how can you inspire them to pursue an education when they know that, even without a diploma or degree, they can receive various forms of government support and settlement amounts?

Mr. Hill responded that economic development and education are critically linked and that what is wanted is that the stream of economic opportunity flow through the reservation so that Indian young people can participate. We want bright kids to be able to bridge back into the community. We want to preserve the culture, *and* we want our kids to be able to go to Cornell or Princeton.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy raised her concern that care be taken in the terms being used. The reference to "skills that will enable them to make choices between vocational, technical," etc. tends to guide Indian children toward subservient, less skilled opportunities and denies us the opportunity to build leadership and train professionals who are thinking about and critically identifying our destinies. Others concurred.

Mr. Fullerton suggested that we ought to also consider health issues. Schools can't educate a child who is hungry and sick, or try to push a child toward an inaccessible educational standard.

Mr. Tullis added that what was really being discussed was the survival of Indian nations. If we send our brightest to school, what are we doing to bring them back so we don't lose one of our accomplishments? What do we want--improvement of education to serve individuals or Indian nations?

It was generally agreed that the Task Force must focus on the needs of the learner and of the community and remember that the mission is more than simply to make schools effective. The reference to teachers should also be expanded to include administrators.

The morning session adjourned.

Monday, May 14, 1990 - Afternoon Session

At 1:30 pm, Dr. Demmert opened the session to public testimony.

Public Testimony

Ron Houston, Human Civil Rights Specialist, National Education Association, presented testimony based on a 1987 NEA study completed by their Special Study Committee on American Indian/Alaskan Native Concerns. This committee held regional hearings and visited schools in February 1987 in Minneapolis, MN, Washington, DC, Phoenix/Tempe, AZ, Anchorage, AK, and Buffalo, NY. Groups and individuals who testified cited inadequate funding, student mobility, and institutional rigidity as the major issues in American Indian/Alaskan Native education. Funding issues included the adverse impact of inadequate and untimely congressional appropriations to the Department of the Interior. Institutional rigidity results in schools that cannot address the needs of mobile students or potential dropouts and have no capacity for utilizing culturally relevant teaching techniques. Schools that fail to acknowledge the diversity of the American Indian/Alaskan Native population and fail to teach non-Indians about tribal government and Indian culture hurt all children, creating lack of understanding in the population at large.

The NEA Study Committee determined that no good statistics are available to document the huge dropout problem in Indian education. For this reason, NEA has commissioned a study with Arizona State University to establish the national Indian dropout rate. This is currently in process and the results are expected in August. The Committee also recommended that in order to bring about an improvement in education for Indian children, parents, and communities, there is a need for a clearinghouse of materials for Indian education. Since Arizona State University was working on such an effort already, NEA tied in with them and provided additional funding. This clearinghouse is now in its third year of operation.

Another clear priority established by this study was the need for more teachers of American Indian/Alaskan Native descent. One of the study's recommendations was that a program be put in place to address this issue.

Overall, the NEA study committee found a tremendous grassroots commitment to improving education for American Indians and Alaskan Natives. The NEA supports the Task Force efforts to address Indian education issues. Mr. Houston distributed copies of the "Report of the American Indian/Alaskan Native Concerns Study Committee" to members of the Task Force.

Mr. Fullerton asked if NEA had any ideas or programs established to recruit Native American teachers or interest them in teaching. Mr. Houston indicated that NEA has developed posters to attract minorities at teachers colleges and that this is an area where they are still looking for ways to motivate young people. Dr. Demmert added that NEA has funded a video through its Alaska office to recruit Alaskan Natives and has also founded a Future Teachers of Alaska organization.

Mr. Fullerton then asked if teachers are held in high regard by Indian communities. Dr. Demmert said that generally they are, but of course it depends on individuals. Dr. Swan noted that in surveys conducted among Indian youth, teaching was the least desired career.

Mr. Ely expressed interest in the methodology being used for data collection on Indian student dropouts. Mr. Houston indicated that the Task Force should contact Karen Swisher, Department of Indian Education at Arizona State University, for this information.

Dr. Beaulieu asked whether there had been any attempt to try to figure out the differences between schools with low and high attrition rates to get a sense of what works. Dr. White suggested the Task Force might want to look at ASU's proposal to form a clearer picture of the methodology, which he agreed was a critical issue. Dr. Demmert agreed, noting that any useful data would need to be stratified across rural and urban settings. In Alaska they have found that although a higher proportion of Native students in rural areas graduate, their achievement is very poor, whereas in urban areas the dropout rate is much higher.

Mr. Houston agreed to provide a copy of the ASU proposal to the Task Force for their review. There were no further questions.

Since there were no other individuals wishing to present public testimony, Dr. Demmert directed the Task Force to continue the morning's discussion of Guiding Principles.

Guiding Principles (cont.)

- Parents, community leaders and Elders ...

In response to principle four, Dr. Swan pointed out that school boards had been left out and that this was a very important group to include when we are talking about effective schooling. Dr. Demmert suggested that we might want to state it as a "partnership" between parents, community leaders, and school boards.

Mr. Ely asked if the Task Force was going to discuss day care. Dr. Demmert indicated that this should be expanded to include parenting and early childhood education. Dr. Beaulieu concurred, noting that a needs assessment study conducted in Minnesota found that parent involvement was considered a top priority in two ways: (1) parents as active advocates for their children's education, and (2) parenting education and academic support.

- Real change will require genuine commitment ...

With respect to the need for linkages between schools and the business community, between education and work, Dr. Swan said that tribal governments should be added because full partnership in the effort was key to success. Dr. Demmert agreed and added "Native corporations." Dr. Beaulieu suggested that we need to look at the "whole child" and create a partnership in the broad sense of all institutions and agencies that touch kids' lives.

Mr. Fullerton wondered if adult education should be included. Mr. Tullis agreed, saying that parent levels of education are very important because of the close relationship between parent education and child success. Children of doctors are far more likely to go into medicine than are other children, for instance. Mr. Sidney added that we need to look at success and look to successful models as a part of our guiding principles.

Dr. Demmert summarized, saying that for the report the Task Force would have to balance problem statements with movement toward solutions. Since Monday's agenda had been covered and no new testimony was pending, he recommended that the Task Force move on to items on Tuesday's agenda.

Contents of Indian Nations At Risk Final Report

Dr. Ginsburg provided an overview of the resources available to the Task Force through ED, suggesting that the outline of topics would probably drive the content of the final report. The data bases include NELS 88 (8th grade data from this study has been included in the Task Force briefing book), High School and Beyond, Office for Civil Rights data (1986 is the latest available data--they collected data in 1988 but ran out of funding for the analysis), Census data, and Health and Human Services data.

Such data could be used to identify the different types of schools Indian children attend, particularly by their concentration in the study body, state and rural/urban location. The staff has put together information from past studies and reports. Issue papers could be commissioned to address some of the problems that have been previously identified. Papers could look at programs that work--success stories. A range of papers could be pulled together by people who already have expertise in key areas.

Dr. Beaulieu stressed the need to think about the validity and reliability of existing data. In Minnesota, 25 percent of the data collected regarding ethnicity is questionable. Additionally, in some local educational agencies (LEAs), 50 percent of the students in one class are different from year to year, so comparisons cannot be drawn, and it is generally necessary to exercise caution when tracking programs or students from year to year.

Dr. Ginsburg pointed out that Congress has mandated a longitudinal study on the effectiveness of Chapter 1. We could ask for a sample of Native Americans, but as it is currently structured, they do not show up in large enough numbers in a fully random national sample. To subsample a sufficient number of Native American children would be expensive, and well beyond the current authorization level. This study also includes a best practices and approaches piece, and we will have some information on this in two years.

Perspectives of Individual Task Force Members

Dr. Demmert indicated that he would like to give members of the Task Force an individual opportunity to express the problems as they see them and to propose possible solutions. Ten minutes each would be allowed for members to provide their perspectives and identify areas of concern that might not have been considered thus far.

Dr. David L. Beaulieu

The vast majority of Minnesota's Indian students are in public schools, and therefore Dr. Beaulieu believes that the role of the state in providing Indian education is very important. The key is to establish a cooperative effort among the communities, the tribes, and the state to identify goals and lobby for legislation that will help improve services. He feels that Minnesota's efforts in this area are exemplary.

In 1955, the state sponsored a scholarship program as the key component of its Indian education program. The program assisted 10 out of 22 students to go to school. At that time only 50 Indian students statewide graduated from high school. The role of the state was "providing a place" where Indians could go to school. Today the state contributes $1.6 million out of general school funds, and this is matched with $1.4 million to provide scholarships. Even at this level of funding they had to turn away 750 applicants last year. This transition is a one-generation phenomenon. Minnesota has 6,500 Indian students who have completed public high school in the last four years, so this has been the cornerstone of the state's effort.

Another key piece has been the American Indian Language and Culture Act, which mandates that schools provide equal opportunity to students by assuring that native language and culture are reflected in schooling. This means that programs must be designed for Indians.

Without the support of tribal governments, it would not be possible to do anything in Minnesota. Efforts are very much a cooperative agenda. In 1986, the state completed a comprehensive plan for Indian education which includes a number of initiatives that all constituent groups could support.

The Tribal Equalization Bill establishes a formula for equalizing state funding for Indian children, bringing it up to the level provided to average public school students. This is accomplished through a state grant. With advisory input, Minnesota has worked to put into state law things that are missing from federal law and thereby force local schools to cooperate. Out of dismay that nothing has changed over the years, Minnesota has worked to reform the structure of schools receiving federal monies. All schools must have parent advisory committees, and the role of these committees has been expanded to include advising in every aspect of school programs through the local school board. The state requires districts with 10 or more Indian students to develop a long-range plan (with parent input) that includes goals and measurable outcomes for serving Indian children. This is an effort to change the structure whereby LEAs receive their information on needs. We believe, in this manner, that we have found a way for state, tribal government and public schools to work together.

Our greatest challenge is in urban areas where policies such as those governing desegregation conflict with the needs of Indian education by isolating students in small pockets where they are less easily served.

Mr. Joseph H. Ely

As a Tribal Chairman, my goal has been to improve life for Indian peoples on and off the reservation. I have heard many goals expressed, but ours is to provide a system where students will become positive contributors to society on and off the reservation. We are alarmed at the prospect of losing our economy, our reservations, and our identity as Indian people. Education has become a focal point of our survival, yet we understand that both education and economic development must go hand in hand. This is not a chicken and egg proposition--they are inseparable. With education, our society will be ensured its survival.

The big question is how to go about achieving this objective. First, we have to recognize that Indian people will not assimilate. Without this recognition, school teaches one thing and home teaches another regarding who Indian people are and what their goals are. What we have, in reality, are two different societies. They can be compatible, and education must work towards that end. Education must teach pride in culture and ways to cooperate and survive in the dominant culture.

Second, we must learn to work with what we have and not make excuses on the basis of lack of money. We can make changes, and we have to become more creative in making do with the resources we have.

Finally, we must work to improve the status of reservations so that they become a positive, contributing factor in society.

Mr. Byron F. Fullerton

I am not involved directly in Indian education and so my key questions are as follows:

(1) I would like to know what the deficiencies are in curriculum in areas where large numbers of Indian students attend school. In other words, what needs to be added to improve education for Native Americans?

(2) How can we improve teacher recruitment and training? Teaching is the only profession that doesn't go after the top 10 to 15 percent of college graduates to enter the field. We should be saying, "We want you to teach because you are bright!"

(3) Why do so many students drop out? As dean of a law school, I wanted to know personally why individuals were choosing to leave school. Furthermore, what is being done to overcome these causes? If children are under age 16, is parental permission required to drop out? If parents had a stronger sense of the importance of education, perhaps they would be more reluctant to allow their children to drop out.

Finally, let us see if we can propose a model program to help keep these students in school.

Mr. Robert G. Martin

Coming from the perspective of higher education, I would like to look at success rate factors and dropout rates in college. In some colleges the first year attrition rate is as high as 50 to 85 percent. We need to examine the part that role models, cooperative eduction, and other strategies can play in reducing these unacceptably high numbers. At Haskell, we have found that the earlier students identify careers and become engaged in actual job experiences, particularly through mentoring and cooperative education programs, the higher their commitment to graduating. Concepts being discussed for elementary and secondary schools in terms of dropout prevention and effective schooling may also be appropriate for colleges.

Furthermore, how do you systematically integrate multicultural education into a public school curriculum, especially when multiple groups are being served? Staff in public schools just don't have the knowledge or the background. By contrast, black and Hispanic students and their needs are less easily overlooked due to their higher numbers. He suggested that we look to the success of Xavier University in preparing black students for medical school as a possible model.

Dr. Demmert noted that James Coburn at NorthWest Regional Educational Laboratory has conducted a study of effective schooling strategies and their application to Indian education which might be worth looking at.

Dr. L. Lamar White

As Director of the Technology Center in Fort Walton Beach, FL, we are trying to give students access to higher technology, in order to prepare them for a life in the 21st century. In this context I believe that data issues are very important. We need to provide our Indian students with the tools they will need to access information. We know, for instance, that computer-assisted instruction is effective and that within Chapter 1, application of technology has been very successful in improving academic achievement. Moreover, computer skills, for their own sake, are important. By the same token, we must not overlook the high technology needs of adults, because they can be the key to economic development in Indian communities.

Mr. Eddie L. Tullis

I believe we must be mindful of the fact that we are talking about a small segment of the education problems in this country. However, we must also be consistently conscious of our need to preserve Indian culture, which has seriously declined over the past decades. We are talking about a population for whom we need to apply things that are already known, rather than reinventing the wheel. We must also remember that the American Indian is coming from a much lower starting point. Education is self-perpetuating: doctors beget doctors and attorneys tend to beget attorneys. We have to keep in mind that Indian children very rapidly outstrip their parents' capacity to help them with their education.

We have an obligation to help American Indians educate themselves as to the contribution that they have made to this country, even though we are only a small segment of the population.

We must also remember that there is now a question of who is actually considered to be an Indian. I predict we will see a jump in the numbers with this latest Census. We operate employment training programs in Alabama, and we can't possibly serve all of the people who decide to become Indian.

We can and must get previous studies of Indian education, putting them together so that we can go forward and recommend solutions. Let us look at the statistics and use them to make something happen that will contribute to the advancement of Indian nations. The overriding issue is that we must deal with the Indian nations or we won't have any Indians.

Dr. Demmert commented that in 1936 we had the Merriman Report, which heavily influenced the BIA and its operations; in 1969 we had Indian Education: A National Tragedy-A National Challenge, which brought about Title IV; and now, 21 years later we will have our report, so the timing is good for us to have a significant impact.

Dr. Robert J. Swan

Dr. Swan agreed with the importance of the Task Force's potential impact. He saw the 1970s as a period in which amazing things happened in Indian education yet the 1980s was a time of retrenchment.

We have the smallest reservation in Montana, and it offers an innovative and unique school system. We run a Head Start program, a K-8 elementary program, and a high school, which has been BIA but is switching to public because without Title IV, Bilingual Education, and competitive grants, we simply couldn't operate.

Four years ago at Rocky Boy, we didn't have our own competency-based curricular scope and sequence. But we have been involved in setting goals--our school does this for three days each year. We review last year's efforts and look ahead to the following year. Because of this we were one year ahead of the national substance abuse initiative.

We built a new high school when we had been told that there was no money available for such a project. We established our Head Start program when we'd been told there was no funding. We are now planning to build a Special Education wing at the school. Our ninth graders enter with achievement scores that are an average of two years behind, yet the average reading and math scores of this year's graduating seniors was 12.9 grade-level-equivalent. All of our school administrators are Indian, and 40 percent of our teachers are Indian. We have reduced our dropout rate to 20 percent, and yet our graduation requirements are higher than those of the state. Rocky Boy has also been recognized as exemplary by the Chapter 1 program.

Based on our experience, I believe we need to look at programs that work. We also need to look at local initiative versus BIA goals. Education should be left to local control, and people outside the system and community should not be dictating standards and curriculum.

Finally, the high substance abuse problems on reservations suggest that this should be addressed as a very important issue.

Mr. Ivan L. Sidney

Mr. Sidney agreed with the concerns expressed by all of the other Task Force members.

Many of my own experiences come from starting school with no English, attending a Hopi School in Phoenix (which is now closing after 99 years), and serving as Chairman of the Hopi Nation for eight years. In my current position as assistant to the President of Northern Arizona University at Flagstaff, I can assure you that there is still a lot of interest in research with Native Americans. We need to go forward without worrying about stepping on toes.

As Hopi Chairman, I saw that education was not pursued because tribal leaders saw it as a threat to themselves. Those who are educated become an elite group with different concerns. Then there are those with "suitcase degrees" who are not prepared for life on the reservation or in the community at large.

Alcoholism is a key contributor to the dropout situation, and we also have a problem of high levels of child sexual abuse.

Economic development and education must work hand in hand. As an example of the overall problem, we have 900 employees at our mining operation, and only 3 percent are Hopi. The average annual employee salary is $35,000, yet we can't find any eligible Hopi to hire.

We seem to be fast approaching federalism, which will result in a quick takeover of Indian programs by Indian groups. This will be good where we do have leadership, but it is a concern where that leadership does not exist.

We need to look at factors like isolation and its impact on hiring teachers, as well as attracting doctors and nurses. Addressing these issues will take a lot of cooperation between federal agencies and reservations.

The competition between various schools for small number of kids on the reservation (parochial, BIA, private, etc.) disperses our efforts. It takes a population to get the money to fund programs. We need to look at the make-up of school boards and tribal committees, because parents are not sitting on boards where their input is needed. We need the endorsement of tribal councils. Without cooperation we encounter situations where we end up lobbying against ourselves. We even had a case of one reservation store owner protesting the opening of a competitor.

Preparation for college and lack of support systems are problems. We need to guarantee scholarships so we don't waste this money. All high school students who want to go to college should go to nearby universities where we can nurture them and help them succeed, especially for the first two years. Then we can send them away to prestigious universities. There needs to be more articulation between junior colleges and four-year colleges and universities and more support for 2+2 programs.

In reference to the issue of cultural education versus the basics in math, reading, science, etc., we must remember that the community can provide much of the cultural education.

We must not be afraid to raise issues that may be unpopular. We may also need to acknowledge differences in the groups we are serving.

Ms. Wilma J. Robinson

We have no reservations in Oklahoma, and we do have a high dropout rate and a serious drug and alcohol abuse problem. I think we need to look more deeply at why this is true. We need to consider sources in early childhood, self-esteem, family influences, educational and noneducational influences. Indian children do not have the hope that other children have. Welfare is self-perpetuating. We have to provide hope at an early age. Head Start programs are successful because children receive individual attention and because they are in small groups, but these students get lost when they get into the public elementary schools.

We contract all our educational services including our boarding school, and this year all 16 of our graduates went on to postsecondary education. We had our kids out hauling hay and earning money for themselves. It is a small program and successful, again because kids are developing self-esteem.

Most successful programs start with goals. Kids don't learn this for themselves. They need to know that they can have goals and achieve those goals.

Dr. William G. Demmert, Jr.

I am not sure that schools can't provide this personal attention. The issues I would like to see us address include:

(1) It is important to develop a language base to set cognitive skills. This must be done early (prior to age 3), or else students' abilities are limited. In Alaska we are looking at starting school in the language of the community and using that as a base. The problem of teachers adjusting to this policy creates a difficult issue.

(2) The importance of partnership between health, social services, and schools should be examined. We cannot look at education in isolation. There are so many other barriers that kids have a hard time learning and teachers have a hard time teaching.

(3) The role of cultural education must be considered. In Alaska we were promoting a special certificate for language and culture teachers, but it was killed by a Native legislator due to comparable pay issues and affordability, so there are many issues in this area.

(4) The notion of having a Native language policy that would recognize the importance of language, culture, and community and the relationship to self-esteem and self-image should be addressed. Schools and communities should have the option of including this in the curriculum if desired.

(5) We should consider the importance of building a partnership between parents/families and schools for mutual support.

(6) We should explore the relationship between what is learned in school and what is necessary in the world of work (e.g., higher order thinking skills, analytical skills, problem solving), regardless of students' ultimate career goals.

(7) We need to acknowledge the importance of Native American teachers as role models and the quality of teachers that children need to succeed in a multicultural environment.

Dr. Demmert noted that the missing Task Force members would be allowed to share their perspectives the following day. He then suggested that the group move into a discussion of "Possible Topics."

Possible Topics

The Task Force examined the Possible Topics which could be explored through use of syntheses of existing data and research, secondary data sources, field-visits to exemplary programs, and commissioned papers. The group proceeded through the Possible Topics working document, discussing each group of issues in order.

I. Overview of the Challenges: Past Responses and Current Issues

-- Historical and contemporary issues ...

This statement was accepted in its proposed form.

-- Government programs ...

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that this should be expanded to include "resources and regulations" which "affect" (rather than "serve") Native Americans (e.g., desegregation). Others agreed with these changes.

-- Demographics of Native Americans ...

This statement was accepted with no substantive changes.

-- National educational goals ...

Dr. Demmert proposed that the order of this be reversed so that the Task Force would look at Native American education goals and their relevance to the national education goals. Others agreed with this change. This change should also be made in Section III.

II. The Role of Education in Affirming Native American Cultures and Improving Opportunities for American Indian/Alaskan Native Students

-- Curricular reform ...

Dr. Demmert suggested that this statement be expanded to add the phrase "and the need for schools to reflect multicultural diversity."

-- Issues in testing Indian children ...

Dr. Demmert pointed out that tests needed to be "linguistically" as well as culturally appropriate. He also noted that tests should more accurately reflect what Native American children know and need to learn. Dr. Ginsburg observed that there is also a problem with testing for math skills because at higher levels English language skills are required to perform well on math tests. Dr. Demmert added that without linguistically appropriate tests, what is really being tested is a child's ability to translate, not his or her knowledge.

-- Issues in preparation of teachers ...

Dr. Demmert suggested the need to recognize different learning styles and develop new styles via technology. Dr. Beaulieu commented that we shouldn't be thinking of culture as a content area. Rather, it is a social activity which should be reflected in the environment. It is important that it not be limited to a course. We also need some perspective on cultural change, since schooling speaks to change. How can the process of education be congruent with the local culture?

Dr. Swan pointed out a need to address educational leadership as well as teachers. In Montana there are only 2 Indian superintendents in 42 LEAs serving Native Americans. Dr. White agreed and added his concern for more role models in higher education.

Mr. Martin suggested that "retention and placement" of teachers be added to preparation. He also pointed out the problems associated with low salaries. Dr. Beaulieu agreed and felt that "recruitment" should also be included. Dr. Swan noted that Teacher Corps had trained many of those Indian teachers currently teaching and that many of these individuals are now in their 50s and 60s. Recruitment should therefore be a major issue since many will soon be reaching retirement age.

III. Meeting the National Education Goals

As previously noted, this section will be revised at Dr. Demmert's suggestion, to reverse the order and consider Native American educational goals and their relevance to the national goals.

Dr. Ginsburg introduced this section by noting that in the 1980s general educational expenditures rose by 40 percent (adjusted for inflation), while we did not find any comparable increases in student performance as shown by test scores on the "wall chart."
He pointed out that the national goals provide a means for setting targets, for going beyond pumping in further inputs to looking at measurable outcomes and providing accountability through concrete objectives and feedback mechanisms. They build on the school site management concept. Cross-cutting issues are included in the introductory paragraph.

Goal 1. Readiness for School

Dr. Ginsburg explained that the two objectives within this goal are related. Even Start combines parent literacy with having parents work with their children. This is an area where we might want to work with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). He also cited an international conference where France presented its efforts to reinforce parent groups who are working with their children.

Dr. Demmert stressed three areas of concern in school readiness:

1. The importance of understanding linguistic development and culturally appropriate strategies

2. The need for Head Start to be expanded to reflect what is known in these areas

3. The importance of language development in preparing a child to develop the cognitive skills necessary to succeed in school

Dr. Swan suggested that the Task Force might want to commission a paper to explore why Head Start was in HHS rather than ED. Dr. Demmert concurred that we might want to look at the appropriate roles of different agencies.

Dr. Beaulieu pointed out the importance of having data regarding social and family situations and the current environment. He explained that in Minnesota there has been an increase in the poorest families due to teen pregnancy and other situations. There needs to be a good baseline of information on this to determine the rate of increase. The Minnesota Department of Education has collected data on knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of 7th and 11th graders regarding sexual activity, substance abuse, and other related issues. They have also pulled out the Indian data from this survey. Dr. Demmert indicated that Alaska had also conducted such a survey, but that it had been fielded through HHS.

Dr. Swan referred the panel to a book entitled The Broken Cord by Michael Dorris regarding fetal alcohol syndrome, suggesting that the Task Force might want to commission a paper on the relationship between this problem and school readiness.

At this point Dr. Demmert moved that the meeting be recessed until the following morning. All members agreed.

Tuesday, May 15, 1990

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Demmert at 9:00 am. The first item on the agenda was to provide Ms. Pease-Windy Boy and Mr. Norbert Hill an opportunity to share their perspectives on the problems in Indian education and possible solutions.

Ms. Janine Pease-Windy Boy

Bringing the Task Force a perspective from the tribally-controlled colleges, Ms. Pease-Windy Boy made the following points:

First, community-controlled schools are taken for granted in the United States, but they are a very new concept in Indian education. Parental "control" is far different from parental involvement. In public schools Indians are such a minority that they cannot be elected to school boards. They are far more likely to serve on an advisory board in an adjunct role. As students progress through college, we find that they become more self-assured about helping their children. However, an infrastructure of parents who can help or contribute to the management of schools does not exist.

Second, we must look at teacher training, especially as it relates to multicultural education. In general, cultural education is relegated to a single course. In reality, it is gesture, values, attitudes, etc. What is needed are methods for values exploration and strategies for integrating culture into all parts of the curriculum. Teachers are unprepared to deliver this and they have no sense of why it is important. Bilingual and bicultural education is largely an Hispanic enterprise in this country. There are few specialists for Indian educators, and we must undertake to provide this resource for them. We need to marshal all of our resources and creativity in this area because it should pervade our entire educational approach.

Third, it is futile to talk about literacy for parents if funds are not available. In Montana 50 percent of Indian adults are high school dropouts. There is a tremendous gap here where no educational services exist. For the past 12 years at Little Big Horn we have been without any means of supporting adult literacy beyond voluntary efforts.

Finally, we will need to get cooperation from state governments because most Indian children go to public schools.

Mr. Norbert Hill

Speaking from his position as executive director of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Mr. Hill observed that colleges are primarily interested in producing professionals rather than human beings. The emphasis is generally on content rather than values, and this is particularly troubling for Indian education. Members of the Task Force may find interesting two recent articles published in Winds of Change. They are "Knowing and Understanding: Traditional Education in the Modern World" and "Traditional Technology", both by Vine Deloria, Jr. which address some of these concerns. Lisbeth B. Schorr's book, Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage, raises some key issues worth considering as the Task Force studies issues in educational reform.

We, as Indians, need to hold ourselves accountable in improving education. The film "Healing the Hurt" is one that everyone should see. It deals with sending parents and grandparents away to boarding schools and its impact on family, transmission and culture, and attitudes toward school.

We have to honor the inseparability of Indian education, our personal growth, our values, and our communities. We must reconcile Western science to our values. Education needs to be structured so that it will give something back to the communities. Sandia Laboratory has solar panels which have provided electricity on reservations. With light in the hogan, an old woman will say, "Now I can quilt at night," and a young boy will say, "Now I can read and do my homework at night." An analysis of the water that flows through the reservation and the sources of its pollution should not be an extra credit project. It should be an integral part of a culturally congruent curriculum. Education is part of the healing circle.

In higher education we find at University of New Mexico that only 3 percent of Indian students who have attended over the past several years have graduated. Perhaps we need to prepare a list of the colleges and universities where our children can go to school and succeed--where they have the infrastructure to support Indian students.

In mathematics we need parent workshops. Most parents don't know the difference between arithmetic and mathematics. They need to understand that math is not negotiable. We have to argue for a balance between the humanities, spiritual integrity, math, science, and technology.

Mr. Hill mentioned that he had a speech prepared on development of a science/health curriculum with a substance focus, which he would give the chair for the record.

Guiding Principles and Possible Topics

The Task Force reviewed adjustments to the "Guiding Principles" that had been made at their suggestion. Dr. Swan indicated that he still had a problem with the term "Native Americans" and preferred the use of "Indian Nations." Discussion followed in which it was agreed that the terminology was important, that "Indian Nations" could not be used because it would exclude Alaskan Natives who do not consider themselves Indian, and that the group would ignore the dilemma for now and return to it later. Other changes to this document were approved.

Recommendations were made for changes in the last two principles to (1) accommodate the notion of creating partnerships among parents, elders, community leaders, and schools to address the issue of building a supportive environment for education; and (2) include "educational organizations" in those groups from whom a genuine commitment is needed to improve the life-chances of Native Americans.

The group then resumed its discussion of Possible Topics. Dr. Ginsburg recapped the previous day's discussion and indicated that the Task Force might want to make recommendations on federal demonstrations that could be sponsored. He also noted that Chapter 1 funds might be available to support the task force's efforts. In addition, Dr. Ginsburg mentioned that HHS and ED had been talking about service integration and that Chapter 1 and Head Start needed to talk to each other. Regarding family literacy, he said that BIA schools were not eligible for Even Start funding, but that discussions were underway to change that situation.

As the group reviewed the changes suggested Monday, Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that her college has looked at Early Childhood training and Head Start teaching within the context of tribal training and has developed a culturally relevant approach.

Dr. Demmert and Dr. Beaulieu repeated their concerns that the goals be approached from an Indian perspective rather than a national perspective and that they be built "from the bottom up." Dr. Beaulieu wondered if it might be better to wait until testimony had been heard. Dr. Swan concurred and shared BIA's experience when the agency came up with four goals and people were upset because they had not been consulted.

Suggestions for grassroots goal identification included using a survey in addition to hearing testimony and making use of existing testimonial data. Mr. Ely observed that the culture was not static and that goals were constantly evolving. Dr. Beaulieu agreed that goals needed to reflect a sense of where we've been and where we are going. As an example of where the national goals differed from Indian education goals, Dr. Swan noted that BIA's goals include parental involvement.

Dr. Demmert suggested that the Task Force might want to identify what some of the goals might be and test these on the basis of reports coming in. In this way we could revise as we go, but at least we would have a head start on the process of building community-based, grassroots- originated goals that could generate support across the country. One of the first goals we might identify would be to increase parental involvement from early childhood through college/university.

Mr. Sidney proposed that the Task Force stick with broad goals in order to avoid areas where groups differed culturally. Dr. Demmert agreed that the statements should allow for local interpretation and direction.

Dr. Swan reported that other BIA goals included significantly improving student achievement and improving teacher training. Mr. Hill asked about the view toward integration of curriculum and culture. Dr. Demmert proposed that this could be included in another goal that would stress the importance of cultural relevance in the curriculum.

Mr. Hill asked about the Department's position on bilingual education, and Dr. Ginsburg replied that it should be locally determined whether the school would use an immersion or transitional approach and that the scope of the legislation includes both options. Dr. Swan pointed out that 95 percent of the funding is in transitional bilingual education rather than developmental and that it is crazy to immerse Indian children in English in elementary school at the expense of their native language and then turn around and require that they learn a "second language" in high school.

Mr. Ely suggested that the Task Force recognize the need for day care curriculum apart from support of elementary school early childhood education. Day care curriculum would involve parents, and it would be important to state it as "day care" to avoid confusion with Head Start and kindergarten.

Dr. Ginsburg again noted that the idea under the national goals is to move toward outcomes so that people can be held accountable and that all of the early childhood, day care, Head Start programs were basically means of achieving the readiness goal. Mr. Ely added that the outcome should go beyond just graduating kids and rather should be to have our people become contributing members of society. Dr. Swan indicated that he had no problem with the six national goals but felt that the Task Force might need to add some which are of priority to Indians. Dr. Beaulieu suggested that the goals need to be interpreted in terms of Indian perspectives, and we need to look at the way Indians act as consumers of education--starting and finishing school may not be an appropriate framework.

A break was taken, after which Dr. Demmert introduced Dr. John T. MacDonald, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, who spoke to the group.

Overview of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs Serving American Indians/Alaskan Natives

Dr. MacDonald indicated that the success of this Task Force effort would depend on being candid and producing a powerful report. There are over 350,000 Indian children in this country; 35,000 of them are served by Indian schools. Approximately $73 million dollars is allocated to this effort through the Indian Education Act, and when you look at total programs, the amount is closer to half a billion dollars. There are nine set-asides including Adult Basic Education, Chapter 1, Special Education, Drug Free Schools and Communities, Employment and Training, and others.

If one critical need exists, it is to coordinate the efforts of all these programs to assure that services are actually reaching children. We must be constantly vigilant at federal, state, and local levels to assure this; otherwise, our programs and dollars will have little or no impact. At the federal level we are tired of seeing all kinds of legislative layers. There is a clear need to synthesize and consolidate. With this in mind, we have opened a dialogue with BIA to work out shared mission and goal statements, and to work out issues regarding Chapter 1 compliance. As a follow-on to this activity, we will look at each program's funding to see where problems exist that interfere with delivery of services and where there is potential for coordinating efforts.

We now have a new Director of the Office of Indian Education, Dr. John Tippeconnic. His appointment was confirmed in March, and he has asked each program director to submit goals and objectives and to identify areas of need and priorities. We already know that we need to better understand BIA structure, and we need to access more data about the status of Indian education. Plans are being discussed to automate data collection. ED is five years behind the SEAs in this effort. The systems are not in place, data bases are not there, and networks are missing. This is also an area of concern.

Dr. MacDonald distributed to the Task Force copies of his May 24, 1990, memorandum to Charles Kolb. This memorandum discusses exemplary sites in Indian education and lists various federal programs serving Indians and the respective appropriations. He then entertained questions from Task Force members.

Mr. Hill inquired about teacher education and whether or not any set-asides would be possible to address problems in this area. He suggested a new program like a "fund for the improvement of Indian education" that could seek out and support innovative programs and then leverage institutional change. Dr. MacDonald replied that this would fit within existing funds for improvement of education and that the Task Force should propose such an initiative.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy raised her concern that set-asides are a piecemeal approach and that programs funded in this way fade when the funding is no longer available. There needs to be consistency to assure that successful programs can continue. She asked if Dr. MacDonald saw the government withdrawing from discretionary approaches. He confirmed this, indicating that this reflects a concern of the states. It is an issue of greater flexibility in regulations. We have been "demonstrated to death." If we are going to "seed" things, we must be clear about this from the outset and fund projects for a longer period. Schools can buy in on this basis. The government is also encouraging more cooperation among existing funding programs.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that set-asides for minorities were particularly hard for Indian educators to compete for because of small numbers and their programs being lost in comparison to larger minority groups. Dr. MacDonald suggested that the Task Force make recommendations for areas where service gaps exist, for instance parent involvement, and that his office could use their report to leverage change.

Possible Topics

The discussion of Possible Topics resumed with a continued look at educational goals. Dr. Demmert indicated that ED staff could worry about stating these goals in terms of outcomes and that the Task Force needed to concentrate on identifying areas of concern.

Goal 1. Readiness for School (cont.)

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy observed that in terms of readiness, bilingual situations may be interpreted as "holding tanks" for children who lack sufficient English.

Goal 2. High School Completion

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy pointed out that graduation very often was merely a social promotion. At Little Big Horn, 95 percent of entering freshmen students have 6th grade math and 8th grade English achievement levels. In this environment a diploma can mean little; we need to see something more meaningful in terms of competencies, proficiencies, and the capacity to acquire a college education or vocational training.

Returning to the discussion of educational goals, Dr. Beaulieu noted that the focus of Goal 2 was on changing students, on trying to capture and hold them, which leaves out a great deal. Maybe it would be best to get a child out of the school and into another setting. In Minnesota, students have the option of enrolling in another school or program where they may be better able to succeed. Many reasons for dropping out are social and environmental. School is part of the problem. Perhaps we should be focusing on changing the school. Many who drop out are among the brightest, and their decision is a good one because it gets them out of a deadening environment. Minnesota had a Title IV program designed to bring students back into school, and we had a staff person who could find all of them and bring them back in, but the schools sent them home again due to "improper reentry procedures", creating a revolving door.

Mr. Hill concurred, pointing out that we are always trying to fix the kids so they can work in a dysfunctional system that is alienating them. We need to focus on correcting a leaky system. The issue is institutional change and how we can leverage this change. It is labor intensive to work with every kid, whereas you get long-term change only by working on the system. Dr. Beaulieu added that some systemic problems are not just Indian education issues, such as decentralization and the size of elementary classrooms, which make it impossible to focus on individual needs.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that we need a section on systemic problems that explores fundamental cross-cutting issues.

Goal 3. Student Achievement and Citizenship

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy wondered what was meant here by "citizenship," and Dr. Ginsburg indicated that the language comes from the national goals and could include many things.

Dr. Beaulieu observed that public schools don't offer leadership opportunities for Indian children; only the best and brightest are chosen. This is one advantage of private schools and minority schools because one way children learn responsibility and citizenship is through such opportunities.

-- Quality of instruction

Changes will be made to this section to reflect concern expressed in earlier discussions about the availability of qualified instructors, particularly in the area of native language and culture. It would also be expanded to look at effective administrator and teacher training and staff development programs.

-- Curriculum development

Dr. Ginsburg noted that this could include access to college preparatory curriculum and more rigor in the classroom. Mr. Ely suggested that curriculum reform should be thought of in terms of philosophy and pertinence to Indian children. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy pointed out that the references to Indians in American history drop off around the 1860s, and we find a seasonal approach to Indian contributions--even in Indian schools (Thanksgiving feast, etc.). We need to talk about the content and the context here so that our substantial contributions are taught. The Newberry Library spent four summers identifying Indian contributions to American history, and there are supplemental texts available as a starting place. We are also dealing with textbook publishers. We cannot expect parents and teachers to shoulder this responsibility. They are often too busy to develop their own curriculum.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that there is even a problem in just having information and materials available to support curriculum goals and objectives. We have taken a vacuum cleaner approach to history, and all of the photos and primary documents are in national galleries where most people rarely have access. We need to develop information structures at the same time that we develop curriculum, and these structures will need to include people in our communities.

A new subsection will be added on community involvement and resources.

-- Student performance

Dr. Ginsburg indicated that staff could add a statement on looking at tests for promotion, college entrance, and placement in special programs in terms of Indian student performance. Dr. Beaulieu agreed, noting that 25 percent of Indian children in public schools are in special education, and in urban areas it is as high as one-third. Anecdotal stories abound regarding kids who were diagnosed as retarded, yet have managed to go to college. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy agreed that this concern should be clearly stated since so many Indian students were being limited on the basis of these tests.

Dr. Swan indicated that there had been talk for 20 years about designing and norming a test for American Indian children. All that tests do now is measure the degree of acculturation. Perhaps this issue should be pursued once again so that students' full potential can be properly assessed.

-- Language maintenance

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy recommended that programs be examined in both "urban and rural settings."

-- Preparation for postsecondary education

Dr. Swan suggested that this should be expanded to look at the high success rates of community college graduates in four-year colleges versus those who go directly to the four-year institutions. Mr. Ely felt it important to look at the availability of financial aid, which seems to go primarily to the four-year institutions rather than community colleges or technical and trade schools. There is a need for across-the-board fairness regarding who gets this aid, so that opportunities exist for all students.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that Minnesota has an Indian Postsecondary Preparation Program which includes 22 projects with different strategies. The Task Force could do a survey of strategies being developed by local school districts. Many of these strategies are just common sense. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that the idea of creating relationships between high school and college be explored. Exchanges of students and faculty and concepts like Upward Bound have made a substantial difference. Dr. Ginsburg noted that ED was about to launch an evaluation of Upward Bound.

At this point members of the Task Force suspended their discussion to receive a telephone greeting from Co-chair Terrel H. Bell in Jackson, MS. He sent greetings to his colleagues and expressed apologies that his schedule had prevented his being with the group. He looks forward to getting acquainted with Task Force members and to the serious responsibility and opportunity they would have to produce a report which will improve Indian education. He is pleased to be co-chairing with Dr. Demmert, hopes the staff will be able to gather very good data about Native American education and learn about the most successful programs, and hopes that the group will write a short and powerful report. He will try to be with the Task Force for its next meeting in Juneau.

IV. The Role of Postsecondary Education

Mr. Hill suggested that the goals should be to (1) increase the number of teachers being trained, (2) improve the quality of teacher training programs, and (3) educate teachers on how to incorporate Indian culture into the whole curriculum. Dr. Swan said that the group must also look at the National Teacher Exam for cultural bias. Many Indians fail this exam and the problem must be viewed in the context of teacher training.

Mr. Tullis voiced concern that the statement regarding "training for employment" was implying a low expectational level. It is limiting when you start telling a child early that he or she will go to trade school rather than college or university. He asked if any research had been done on the ideal age to tell kids which postsecondary education they ought to pursue. Dr. Demmert observed that the skills necessary for trade and technical school (language abilities, higher order thinking skills) are the same for college and university. He went on to note that building the relationship between business and the community could enable students to see the connection between school and work. These ties could enable kids to recognize necessary work and ethical skills, provide them with an opportunity to develop new interests, a chance to observe role models, and to earn some money. All of this is part of what we should be doing rather than tracking students. We want to give them opportunities and experiences outside of the school setting. Others agreed that tracking was a critical issue and a problem in Indian education; that even as early as middle school, students were being asked to make decisions that could limit them.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that wording could be added to the statement regarding access to the curriculum.

Dr. Demmert noted education's responsibility for helping communities become self-sufficient and providing opportunities to support this goal. He also cited the need to develop administration and staff that to some extent reflect the communities served so that programs can be developed "of and within" rather than "without and for."

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that the Task Force look at other functions of colleges and that they be broadened to include the "land grant" aspects of higher education. Colleges can serve as a research base and a place to discuss issues. We also need to look at the public service components of teacher certification.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy observed that most university systems are repositories of history and scholarship for their nations. Tribal colleges should also pay this role. Many have identified a major archival thrust to establish collections of primary resources, and it is important to support these efforts.

She also indicated that postsecondary education was in deep trouble financially and that many people are on long waiting lists. There are many gaps in the system. BIA funds only 29 percent of its applicants, and half of those receive only partial support. It is hard to fill in with other resources and many cannot qualify for loans and scholarships because they cannot come up with even the initial $90. Yet when you look at the distribution of Title V resources you find that these funds are often going to students with only a tiny percentage of Indian blood. The 1980s was a disaster for us. Others agreed with this point. Dr. Beaulieu noted that increased college expenses had seriously reduced college enrollment of Indians in Minnesota and that they turn away over 150 applicants per year. These young people don't come back once they've been turned down. There is also a notable decline in the number of graduate students as well as those moving into colleges and universities as faculty.

The issue of loans was also raised by Ms. Pease Windy-Boy who explained that default on loans was keeping a high percentage of college dropouts out of college forever. There is no safety net and no hope of every repaying such a loan. Parents need to be advised of the consequences for taking loans.

V. Parents and Community Involvement

Dr. Ginsburg noted that members might want to add a sub-section here on community resources and inclusion of community elders who can serve as resources to the education process. He further suggested that the group may want to recommend a special program to highlight effective approaches to generating further parental involvement and the role that can be played by tribal institutions.

Dr. Demmert proposed that the statement go further to talk of partnerships among schools, parents, and community.

VI. Federal, State and Tribal Operations

Dr. Ginsburg observed that this section was more of a wrap-up and moves the discussion closer to recommendations. He also indicated that we could use the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Centers and the ED Labs and Centers for input in these areas.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the group had not yet discussed ways that state finance and tribal government could cooperate fiscally. The Task Force might want to look at Minnesota's notion of having the money follow the student.

Future Task Force Meetings and Regional Hearings

Members of the Task Force discussed ways to organize future meetings and regional hearings and where and when these meetings might be held. It was generally agreed to hold regional meetings in areas where resources would be available to facilitate public hearings and to attempt to schedule meetings and hearings in concert with other scheduled events so that those who want to testify would find it more convenient.

Regional meetings will generally be chaired (with staff support) by the Task Force member whose region hosts the meeting. Not all members would need to attend all sessions but at least one or two should be present at each. Meetings could be hosted by universities or tribal groups. There may be occasions when full Task Force meetings could be held in addition to regional hearings.

Dr. Swan invited the Task Force to schedule a full meeting in San Diego in conjunction with the National Indian Education Association's Conference, October 13-17, 1990. Many people would be in attendance, and it would be possible and advisable to schedule two full days of public testimony. Written testimony could be requested in advance and a five minute limit could be placed on oral testimony. Another possibility would be to split the Task Force into different rooms to accommodate additional testimony and good question-and-answer sessions.

Regular Meetings were tentatively scheduled as follows:

July 16-17, 1990	Juneau, AK with regional hearings for Alaska Natives
October 15-17, 1990	San Diego, CA with two days of public testimony
January/February, 1991	Albuquerque/Flagstaff/Phoenix to be determined by whichever locale would not be selected for regional hearings
May, 1991	Washington, DC upon release of the Task Force report

Regional meetings should be held by early fall in order to allow the Task Force to make good use of the recommendations gathered. Mr. Hill suggested that a letter from the Secretary of Education might be nice politically to generate cooperation from potential host universities.

Ms. Hunt recommended that some measures be taken to avoid the kind of repetitive testimony that frequently occurs at these kinds of hearings. It might be wise to have different sessions on different issue areas to have discussion rather than hours of testimony. She also suggested that the Task Force might want to make use of NACIE issues sessions and not duplicate sites.

Wednesday, May 16, 1990

Regional Hearings

The discussion of Regional Hearings resumed. Mr. Tullis noted that USET, the United Southern and Eastern Tribes, is an organization which includes 18 tribes and covers most of the Eastern seaboard. He recommended that the Task Force therefore save time by going to only one Eastern location--USET headquarters in Nashville, TN. The other possibility would be Cherokee, NC, where they have scheduled a regional meeting in the first week of October. This recommendation was accepted, and it was agreed that Mr. Tullis would host the meeting and that Dr. White and Mr. Fullerton would also participate in these hearings.

Dr. Swan indicated that it would not be feasible to combine the North and Northwest hearings because too many people would be unable to attend one or the other. It was therefore agreed to hold one meeting in Billings, MT, in late July with Dr. Swan and Ms. Pease-Windy Boy serving as co-hosts.

Dr. Beaulieu offered to host hearings in Minneapolis for the Great Lakes area, figuring that these hearings would draw in representatives from Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and possibly Nebraska and Iowa. These might be scheduled in September.

Mr. Ely and Mr. Sidney will co-host the Southwest meeting. Mr. Hill felt that Arizona State University would be glad to host these hearings. It was suggested that Phoenix would be a more feasible location for drawing testimony from Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Mr. Martin will work with Ms. Robinson to co-chair the South Plains/Oklahoma hearings. They will check with the tribes for a good meeting date.

Dr. Demmert suggested that Mr. Joe Coburn of the NorthWest Regional Educational Laboratory could be asked to host the Northwest region hearings in Seattle. Mr. Hill and Mr. Ely would attend on behalf of the Task Force, but they are located at too great a distance to effectively coordinate these hearings.

Dr. Demmert will host separate hearings in Alaska through the Alaska Federation of Natives.

Discussion followed on the need to let people know well in advance through the Federal Register and other public means. It was also deemed advisable to invite written testimony at any time.

The dates and locations for Full Task Force Meetings were reviewed and accepted. Dr. Swan requested that he and others receive advance information about programs in Alaska so that they could schedule site visits in conjunction with the meeting.

Review of Revised Guiding Principles

After considerable discussion, the Task Force agreed that the references to American Natives be changed in all cases to "American Indians/Alaska Natives." The only other change proposed was that "teachers and principals" become "school personnel" to encompass all school staff.

Review of Revised Possible Topics

Members were generally pleased with the revision that had been made on the basis of the previous day's discussion. Once again it was agreed to change references to Native Americans to "American Indians/Alaska Natives."

Dr. Demmert recommended that in Section II the issue of curricular reform be stated separately from the issue of need for schools to reflect multicultural diversity.

In reference to Section III, Dr. White wondered if there was a need to identify the "competencies needed for their futures" or if this should be left for communities to develop locally.

The group agreed that a separate bullet be added on the issue of expectations of school personnel, that the section on preparation for postsecondary education be moved to Section IV, and that the subgoal of community involvement be moved to Section V. Dr. Demmert asked that the subgoal on language maintenance be expanded to include language "development."

Other issues discussed included the need to equip schools with up-to-date technology and trained staff as an essential part of raising student performance and/or quality of instruction; the need within math and science to incorporate the local and regional environment as a base for learning; and the importance of discussing development of a language base as the first step in developing cognitive skills to allow students to succeed. Dr. White suggested that improvement in literacy and language skills might be an area where Indian education goals must go beyond the national education goals.

It was also suggested that "community service" or service learning ought to be an integral part of revitalizing the curriculum and expanding the leadership base.

Dr. Beaulieu stressed the importance of recognizing the needs of adults in the community for services which are not important for jobs but are generally good for the community. Increasing the level of information about health, personal finance, homemaking, and other life coping skills is a role that tribal colleges could effectively play.

In Section IV, Dr. Demmert noted that the importance of non-tribal public and private institutions had been diminished in the introductory paragraph and in the first subgoal.

Dr. Swan recommended that the Task Force look at development of a good tracking system to follow students from elementary through secondary and postsecondary education. Others suspected that many who don't succeed in college are really finishing high school during their first semester. Mr. Hill proposed establishment of an American Indian Clearinghouse for Indian Students in Postsecondary Education.

Within the subgoal describing the possible roles for postsecondary institutions, the group agreed that "research, public service, and assistance to communities in becoming self-sufficient" needed to be added.

In Section V, Mr. Hill asked that the statement be more balanced to reflect an understanding of parents as an intelligent resource for schools. We need to talk about schools being receptive to parents. It was agreed that "partnership" was a good term to use.

In Section VI, Dr. Ginsburg suggested that strategies for accountability may need to be separated out. Dr. Beaulieu noted that the whole system currently gets rewarded for failure. More money is given for more documented failure, and money drives the system. If we begin to talk about money following students the focus shifts. The real issue is how funding is allocated to students in Indian reservations versus how public schools are financed and the ways these policies limit options. Dr. Demmert agreed that finance was a major problem especially in rural schools.

Dr. White asked if we were looking for specific indicators, and Dr. Ginsburg said that there is a range of measures, including test scores and others, that would evolve through the process.

Next Steps

Dr. Ginsburg indicated that the staff would next look at the topics for cross-cutting issues and translate these into a possible set of papers that could be commissioned. Member recommendations regarding studies and potential consultants will be welcome. These studies could be underway by the time the Task Force reconvenes in Juneau.

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Second Business Meeting: July 17-18, 1990

Juneau, Alaska

The second meeting of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force included the Alaska Regional Hearing of the Task Force. The hearing was held in Centennial Hall Convention Center on July 16, 1990. (See documents related to INAR regional hearings.) The Second Business Meeting of the Task Force, held at the Alaska Department of Education Board Room, was co-chaired by William G. Demmert and Terrel H. Bell. Members present included David L. Beaulieu, Joseph H. Ely, Norbert S. Hill, Jr., Hayes A. Lewis, Bob Martin, Ivan L. Sidney, Robert J. Swan, Eddie L. Tullis, and L. Lamar White. Not in attendance were Byron Fullerton, Janine Pease-Windy Boy, and Wilma J. Robinson. Task Force staff present were Alan Ginsburg, Executive Director; Mike Charleston, Project Director; and Gaye Leia King, Deputy Project Director. Val Plisko, Division Director for Elementary & Secondary Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation Service, also attended the meeting.

Tuesday, July 17, 1990 - Morning Session

The working session was called to order by Co-chair William Demmert. He noted that Bob Arnold, Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs and Ed Parisian, new Director of the Office of Indian Education Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, had been invited to attend the session and share their comments with the Task Force. He also noted that the Task Force meeting had been highlighted on local television in the 6:00 p.m. news broadcast and that a story would appear in today's local paper, *The Juneau Empire*.

Dr. Demmert suggested that the first portion of the meeting be devoted to review, reflection, and comments on the testimony heard Monday.

Dr. Bell indicated that he had been very impressed with the quality, candor, and sincerity of the testimony that had been presented.

Mr. Ely said that he had walked away yesterday with a number of observations about what they were hearing:

> Parenting is very important! Surrogate parenting is equally important, and is a role that can be played by teachers, staff, or others--possibly mentors. Clearly it is not necessary that actual parents be parenting. There are many instances of grandparents, aunts, uncles, and extended families who are parenting Native children. This is reinforced by Mt. Edgecumbe's success with creating an "extended family" atmosphere.
>
> We must be careful about accepting things that are supposed to be true but may be only trendy. "Culture as a focal point in the curriculum" may be one of these things. The reviews are mixed--we hear some success stories of programs which have nothing to do with this element, and other that do include it as an important feature. I liked the comment that was made about the importance of teaching *using the culture* rather than teaching the culture:
>
> > Jennell was in her home town school--one that had everything people have been talking about as important--yet she fled, she needed to get out in order to find success. I think we need to distinguish between *culture* (which is evolving) and *tradition* (which is stable). Sometimes elements of the culture are not desirable. Her first response to that question may have been more honest.

We must make sure there is a proper balance, so one doesn't override the other, and we must determine what is essential and what is merely trendy.

Mr. Hill noted that the group has been hearing the same things in Alaska that have been heard in other parts of the country (though rural isolation really has meaning here in Alaska).

One clear message we are hearing is that changes will cost money--commitment without cash is counterfeit.

Although people didn't use the "R word" much yesterday, "racism" is something our kids deal with every day. It is an issue we as a Task Force must also deal with.

The 1990 Census will probably confirm our estimate that 70 percent of Native Americans are urban, while 30 percent are still on reservations or rural. Given this situation, can children have mentors outside the cultural context? Can grandparents help children when they grew up in a different culture?

We do need to celebrate our successes because they give us hope, but we also need to acknowledge the fact that we have a system-wide failure in education.

It is depressing!

Mr. Lewis observed that Indian children do not have the things that a democratic country should provide:

People testifying yesterday were saying over and over, "we want access," "we want equal opportunity." Why don't we have it, even though we have well-developed systems that bring these things to others?

We have to have a sense of urgency about the needs of our people. The way the nation treats Native people is a "bellwether" of other societal failings. We need to see why our policies have failed and what needs to be done to have an impact at local levels, where it will make sense.

We need to be clear about our purposes. What does success mean to Native people? Will we prepare our children to continue to live in their own communities, or will we create a brain drain? How can we state our purposes in a way that is regenerative and serves the perceived needs of Native communities?

It is important to re-energize Native language and culture as a way of thinking and learning.

There are pockets of hope and relationships which cause people to care about one another. We are starting to see these kinds of connections that will lead to other kinds of involvement. We are starting to see opportunities that will lead to addressing the needs of Native children. One example was the Tlingit man who is serving on an Action Team with his superintendent.

Dr. Beaulieu commented that one of the group's responsibilities as a Task Force is to reflect upon the similarity of what people are saying. We also need to reflect on how recent our issues are--they are largely the result of a single generation of major and rapid change in schooling for Native children. When my grandfather was young, 90 percent of Chippewa youth had no place to go to school.

Many of the issues that were discussed go to the heart of institutional schooling within a community. Schools have been thrust into communities. They need to function in relation to the needs of their communities. Policies need to be in place to help this happen, so that communities can agree on their purposes. The idea of parental involvement is clearly important and one that some Alaskan communities are working on--like the group from Bethel that is working to establish community advisory boards in their villages.

Everyone who testified knew what was wrong with their schools and what was needed to bring about change. But the schools themselves and the people in them do not seem to have the capacity to respond. We know what kinds of teachers we want--why can't we get them? The same thing is true for curriculum. We heard testimony about re-introducing the culture with the help of Elders who are willing to come into the schools. Yet they are unable to teach because they lack the materials or because the schools have rules that are barriers (like the need for certification).

We need to become more sophisticated in describing what we mean by culture. There is a clear difference between "teaching the culture" and "using the culture to teach." The environment of the school must be conducive to bringing the culture in--there should be nothing threatening about this.

Mr. Sydney said that being a desert person, he was "overwhelmed by Alaska!" "I've never seen so much water in my life!"

> One can feel the isolation here and given the terrain, it will probably be around for some time to come. In the interim, as a means of providing support to rural schools, perhaps interactive television could be pursued as an answer to some of the problems with facilities, etc.
>
> Another thing that has impressed me is that "success" was talked about in the testimony. People who testify at other hearings will say similar things about the problems, but now we are bringing in some of the successes.
>
> Accountability is clearly an issue we need to look at as a Task Force. We need to examine all of the funding that comes out of Washington, DC, and ask where it is going.
>
> Parenting is an issue that comes up repeatedly, but no one is talking about what specific kinds of training we need to provide to parents. In my region, the superintendent ends up becoming a "tsar." Parents need to know how to become meaningfully involved.

Mr. Martin observed that everyone who testified seemed to be speaking from the heart. We struggle with our accomplishments and yet we have only been working on some of these issues, like empowerment, for a relatively short time.

We do need to focus on the culture of the schools--on the attitudes and values that prevail among administrators and teachers. We simply cannot tolerate racism in these people.

We have been discussing the "process" for bringing about change, and we have been talking about the importance of local planning--but as a Task Force, we must look at this within the context of state and federal policy.

Mr. Ely indicated his disappointment that the Task Force had not heard from any parents and that only one student had come forward to testify. Their perspective is important to the task of trying to distinguish between culture and condition. Is there any way we can get more parents and students to come in and testify? They sometimes carry a very different message than the professionals. We need to find out from parents why they are not involved. We should realize that parents may feel intimidated coming into a room full of educators, especially if they include people with whom they have been fighting. We may need to set aside a special session just for parents and students.

Student testimony is really important! I talk to students often because my office is located in the high school. I know that half of the students who could attend our school take a bus to a more distant public school. These students have a clear choice between our school, which is culturally relevant, and the public school which does not offer any of the cultural curriculum. Ultimately we may need a dual system to accommodate both those who want to learn to tan hides and learn Indian dances as part of their education, as well as those who want to be able to buy a Lamborghini. The culture is in a transition period and we need to strive to find some kind of balance.

Dr. Bell agreed, and said that in addition, we may need to ask the staff to conduct interviews of individuals, or possibly conduct a poll of Native Americans, in order to assemble reliable data about parents and students. We should have a list of the statistics we need , because we must have the most comprehensive data ever assembled, or our report will be faulty.

Dr. Ginsburg noted that if the Task Force felt it was important to get certain kinds of statistics, they should make this clear, in order that the staff can try to assemble, or find ways to fund, the gathering of such data. In terms of conducting a poll, it is important to remember that we are dealing with a nine-month time frame.

Dr. Bell indicated that when he had been asked by the Secretary to serve as Co-chair, he had asked Cavazos about the availability of funding, and Cavazos had said that the Task Force would get whatever was needed. Dr. Ginsburg noted that about $100,000 has been set aside for commissioned papers.

Dr. Demmert added his observation that many of those who testified Monday were, in fact, parents. However, yesterday we heard from involved parents, and we also need to hear from uninvolved parents.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that a number of good studies had been done regarding Indians served by the Minnesota Department of Education, and that these studies include good parental data that the Task Force might want to look at.

Dr. Bell suggested that the staff could identify state by state the provisions in state law that recognize the state responsibility for serving Indian children. Then we could print out in our report those states that care and those that don't.

Dr. Swan offered his observation that the overriding themes raised Monday were consistent with themes that are heard in the "lower forty-eight":

> Parent involvement seems to be the number-one problem that surfaces in any survey of Indian education. At Rocky Boy School we have a parental institute and we are able to get a certain groups of parents quite enthused. They do come to events, and there is core group that really gets involved. However, no matter what we do, we can't seem to reach the ones we really need to reach.
>
> We need to provide training for school boards. This was stated repeatedly.
>
> The dropout rate is apparently low out in Alaskan bush communities, but parents and concerned community leaders are asking for quality education.
>
> Teachers apparently have low expectations of Alaska Native students, and this is adversely impacting student achievement and attitude toward school. In all of the effective schooling research, high expectations are an essential ingredient.

Mr. Hill raised a question which had come up several times Monday regarding the purpose of education. Are we to try to educate kids for the good of the community, or for the good of individuals? We may have to respond to both perspectives, but we need to be clear.

Mr. Ely agreed, saying that it would be important to be clear about what we are seeking--whether it is mainstreaming or preparation for contributing to ones own community. He added that he was impressed by the person who said that 90 percent of their graduates are unable to survive in their communities with the education they have received in their schools. If there were no TV sets, we would be all right, but we have a tough situation with those who want to subscribe to the American dream of making big money. Some are learning that they can achieve this dream by selling crack cocaine. So we need to think about the differences between education that is community-based and education that addresses both worlds.

Mr. Hill added that in many cases we seem to be warehousing kids, and they are coming to school for social reasons. It seems that the healing of communities should also be addressed by this group.

Dr. Demmert returned to the issue of identifying a list of needed statistics and indicated that Terrel Bell had already started such a list. Dr. Bell said that he had noted about 35 items, some of which might not be right or necessary. Dr. Demmert suggested that the Task Force could get Emerson Elliott and others to look at this list and make comments. Dr. Ginsburg noted that he had already talked with John Tippeconic regarding a joint state survey.

Dr. Beaulieu observed that if you look collectively at the testimony and add key issues together, you have the beginning of a philosophy or at least an overall sense of what is important. We are finding that we may need to look at Indian education in a broader context than we have in the past. Most important, we need to find the words to express this collective sense of priorities--this should be one of our goals. Dr. Demmert suggested that Alan Ginsburg and the staff could work on this and then the Task Force could review such a statement of philosophy and try to reach consensus.

Dr. Bell said that reaching consensus, when the draft is before the group, will be the real challenge. The report has to be eloquent, especially the first four or five paragraphs. These really have to have punch! We want this to be a report we can be proud of. The first five pages have to be powerful, or else it will be a dud. We had quite a time reaching consensus with the Nation At Risk. We had the President scheduled for a press conference, but we couldn't agree on the language. We had four dissenters in the group. Al Gardiner wanted a unanimous report. We were ultimately able to reach consensus, but I thought we'd never get there and felt that having agreement with 14 out of 18 was a miracle by itself.

Mr. Ely returned to the question about the quality of education in rural areas. We are hearing that students are graduating but they are two years behind academically. If they were caught up, would this be considered "quality"? Dr. Demmert confirmed this in part, explaining that the definition of "quality" would be a broad one, and academic performance would be only one element.

At 10:00 am Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Tuesday, July 17, 1990 - Morning Session - Continued

Ed Parisian was asked to present his overview of the BIA Mini-Summits. He offered members of the Task Force copies of the BIA's Executive Summary and documentation of the Mini-Summits. (Available upon request).

The Department of the Interior's education summit conferences on Indian education were held in Santa Fe, New Mexico; Rapid City, South Dakota; and Spokane, Washington. Approximately 1,375 people representing tribes, school boards, schools, and Indian organizations attended the three summits.

The purpose of the summits was to announce the Department's goals to improve academic achievement to national norms by the year 2000, introduce the four major fiscal year 1991 education initiatives (effective schools, evaluation and accountability, parental involvement/early childhood education, and teacher recruitment and training); solicit concerns and recommendations regarding Indian education; and bring together the people who could forge the cooperative effort needed to improve Indian education on a national basis.

A major finding of the summits was that Indian country strongly supported the Department's school improvement effort and also supported the four major initiatives. Attendees at all three summits also identified the following additional areas as high priority problems facing Indian education:

- maintenance and repair of school facilities
- adequacy of the schools' basic funding level
- the support of the White House Conference on Indian Education
- comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse prevention efforts
- implementation of national consultation sessions

Within each of the four major initiatives and the additional areas of concern, specific recommendations have been documented. The balance of the Executive Summary includes an action plan that we have developed and initiated in each of areas of concern. The remainder of the report is an account of the actual hearings and the recommendations that came from each.

One specific area of current BIA efforts is the establishment of a task force that will meet later this summer to review the ISEP funding formula for our schools--which is now ten years old--and determine its adequacy and recommend changes.

As of Thursday, July 12, 1990, Secretary Lujan, on behalf of the Department of the Interior, has notified the Senate Select Conference Committee that Ivan L. Sidney has been nominated to serve as Director of the White House Conference. Staff people are currently being named by both DOI and DOE. We believe that it will be important to assure that the timing of the White House Conference and the public release of this Task Force's report support each other.

Dr. Bell suggested that since the White House Conference will be after the release of the Task Force report, the Conference could be organized to discuss the implementation of Task Force recommendations. Mr. Parisian indicated that the Conference would be held in 1992 and that DOI has to appoint a 24-member task force that must be approved by Congress within six months. Nominated members will need to go through clearance proceedings.

Mr. Parisian noted that BIA Office of Indian Education would be willing to assist the INAR Task Force in any way to help with data collection, especially regarding the 180 schools BIA serves.

Mr. Ely wondered if the two efforts could start working now to coordinate efforts, so that they will complement one another. Mr. Parisian said they could. The BIA staff needs to work with Alan Ginsburg's staff. We don't have a database in Indian country, and we can certainly work on this together. Mr. Ely wondered if we could coordinate funding. Dr. Demmert noted that the BIA could collect data on their schools far more quickly than DOE and vice versa. There are areas for good cooperation. Mr. Ely indicated that he was reassured to hear this, since it was important to be able to tell people in Indian country that we are all coordinating our efforts. People in Indian country are skeptical about this, and they are already asking questions. Dr. Demmert noted that members could also stress the fact that the Director of the White House

Conference is on the INAR Task Force. Dr. Ginsburg added that Ed Parisian and John Tippeconic are also regularly invited to sit in on INAR Task Force meetings.

Mr. Parisian indicated that one of his personal goals is to develop better coordination between BIA and DOE. This needs to take place and people out in Indian country need to know about it. Mr. Ely suggested that this coordination be mentioned specifically in the BIA newsletter to help clarify the situation. He noted that this newsletter is widely read.

Dr. Bell asked for confirmation of the strategy that the INAR Task Force will gather data and make recommendations and the White House Conference will focus on how to implement these recommendations. Dr. Swan reminded the group that Bob Arnold had recommended that the Task Force report recommend new legislation, new policy, and new budget guidelines. With this charge in mind, it makes a lot of sense to work together.

Mr. Ely noted that this level of collaboration is "highly commendable" and that it is quite a deal to see BIA and DOE working together on Indian education. "This is a real milestone!"

Dr. Demmert then requested a report from David Beaulieu on the State Indian Education Director's Meeting, which was held in Washington, DC, on June 26-27, 1990.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that his focus at the Director's Meeting had been to report on the efforts of the INAR Task Force and to talk to state directors and get their ideas. He indicated that he will have copies of minutes of the meeting for Task Force members, and will summarize the major points that were made.

In response to his presentation to directors on the INAR Task Force, there was a general concern about coordination and almost a "pat response" to the proposed report: "Here is another study that will go on the shelf!"

In fact, Indian education can mark its history by major reports. If we look closely at history, these major reports become vibrant and living documents that sometimes do lead to policy adjustment and major legislative change. We are gaining significant momentum now, with the INAR Task Force, the White House Conference, and the BIA Mini-Summits. We are coming together in a major way, and we may be able to reach a very broad consensus on goals and directions. We need to get this message out! We have reason to be somewhat concerned about our public relations.

During the meeting, state directors got together with Assistant Secretary MacDonald and expressed a number of concerns:

1. There was general agreement that despite all efforts at the federal level, not much has changed for Indian education. The majority of Indians are in public schools, and most of the funding for Indian education is now categorical.

   States need to be more involved because of the legislative context they can provide as a context for programs. Indian education can become the basis for looking at educational reform as a whole. Schools need to respond to the needs of Indians by having more than just "a program."

2. States need to be involved in federal government efforts, specifically:

   a. Better ways of communication need to be established between states and the federal government, especially regarding programs and data

b. States currently have a monitoring role with respect to maintenance of effort, but there may be other roles states could assume (as a formal hook that gets them involved).

3. Indians aren't getting all they should from federal programs. Sometimes this is due to supplanting, and in some cases Title IV may look a lot like Chapter 1. We hear about all the resources that are available, but when we look in the schools, we don't see Indian students participating.

Dr. Swan pointed out that the problem with state education agencies in the late 1960s and early 1970s was related to their desire to "have their say" in programs. From the tribal perspective, when you look at state plans, you see programs such as Vocational Education, Adult Basic Education, Bilingual Education, and at-risk youth initiatives, and you see that they are using our statistics to bring in increased levels of funding. But when the pot is divided at the state level, few Indians get any share. Until the states take legislative responsibility for the education of Indian children, Indians do not want the states telling the federal government what to do about programs.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the state role needs to be developed because states provide the regulatory context for the education of our children-- teacher certification, graduation requirements, and so forth--and until we can influence this context, we have little influence at all. The tribes and those who want to assist them will not see much change without state involvement. The reason we have federal programs which direct funding to LEAs is because of historical problems, as in Johnson O'Malley. But this approach lets the states off the hook, when they should be on the hook.

Dr. Bell wondered how Minnesota had gotten the state involved in the recent past. Dr. Beaulieu indicated that this had been an incremental process due to Native involvement and that the state had backed its commitment by allocating increased state funding to Indian education. Dr. Bell noted that Minnesota seems to be a leader in this area, but he wondered if there are any other states that are involved.

Dr. Beaulieu cited the case of South Dakota, where during a "year of reconciliation," Indian leaders had gone to the legislature to request increased funding for their $50,000 scholarship program. In lobbying for this request, they found they were informing senators of a program they did not know about. The result was that the scholarship program became a victim of overall budget cutting. Rather than receiving an increase, they were cut to $38,000 the first year and eliminated completely the second.

Mr. Lewis agreed that states must be a part of a mainstream effort to bring about change. The New Mexico Center for Excellence is a good example of the potential success of increased state involvement. The Center was formed by a group of 22 school districts that serve Indian populations. The governing board was formed to include representatives from the SEA, the State Legislature--Committee on Indian Affairs, tribal leaders, and students. We must realize, as Indian people, that we can't do it all by ourselves. We will make a difference in policy and practice at the local level through collaborative efforts with the state.

Mr. Lewis referred to Public Law 81-874 on Indian Policies and Procedures, noting that if this is taken as a guiding document for tribal involvement, we can see that states can also be involved at the local level in determining accountability procedures and assuring compliance. Dr. Beaulieu indicated that in Minnesota they had had a similar experience using the state board to pressure local districts. Dr. Demmert said that the government hasn't been very judicious in informing people about 81-874 and Impact Aid. Whoever administers these programs needs to make sure that the Indian involvement portions are carried out.

Mr. Lewis suggested that funding formulas need to be examined on an annual basis, looking specifically at Indian needs, which are currently imbedded in "at risk" needs. Regarding 81-874, New Mexico had taken credit for a 100 percent base with 20 percent add-on, using a calculation that left us with only 5 percent for local development. However, through lobbying, we now have 25 percent available. Dr. Demmert reiterated the need to make sure (1) states pass along the funding, and (2) Indians are involved locally.

Dr. Swan noted that Arizona has a major problem with Indian education funding in public schools because of "equalization."

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that he had passed out for review by Task Force members copies of all state statutes, a comprehensive state-wide plan developed by Minnesota, and a historical piece on tribal and state involvement. He noted that he would talk about urban education later, when the Task Force discusses commissioned papers.

Dr. Bell asked if there was any information available to indicate success in implementing greater local involvement. Dr. Beaulieu replied that there were areas where it had made a difference but that the major issue for Minnesota is trying to solve the problem for Indians in urban schools. The state has mandated involvement of Indian parents, and this is hooked into standard planning for districts, but we haven't seen much of it so far.

Dr. Bell referred to the "Wall Chart" and noted that if you looked at education in those terms, you would find Minnesota is number one. He then asked if Minnesota was also number one in terms of education of Native Americans. Dr. Beaulieu said, "no," that some of the problems Minnesota is dealing with are problems that existed years ago. The state's Indian program began in 1955 with a budget of $2,500. The program has now expanded to $1.6 million, and the state serves over 1,500 students per year. Approximately one-third of their students graduate, and over the years they have graduated approximately 6,500 students. The climate for change and for involvement of tribes and parents is what is different today.

Dr. Bell observed that as we talk about improving education for Indian students, it seems as though the environment in some states is conducive to learning, and in others it is not.

Mr. Sidney then introduced Mr. Ed Sontag to the Task Force members as the official who will be coordinating the White House Conference.

Dr. Demmert asked that Mike Charleston, INAR Project Director, join the group and discuss with Task Force members the process of developing the final report including: outline, commissioned papers, final report, and supplementary publication(s).

Dr. Charleston prefaced his remarks by briefly sharing his experiences two years ago as author of the National Review of Indian Education in Canada, which culminated in a national report and policy statement that has led to important changes in Canada. He noted that here it would be a somewhat more difficult task because we have no nationwide Indian group to work with.

Dr. Charleston then indicated that the process leading to a final report will begin with an invitation for submission of information from state education agencies and Indian Education Act Resource and Evaluation Centers. He noted that the draft invitation was included in members' information packets. States will be asked to submit demographic data on:

1. Indian student populations, including numbers of students by grade level and type of school, measures of academic performance by grade level, and graduation rates

   NOTE: INAR will coordinate with BIA on gathering this data.

2. Native school personnel, including numbers of teachers, administrators, ancillary personnel by grade level and type of school; description of training programs for teachers and administrators of Native students; special and alternative certification requirements

3. Education programs for Native students, including numbers and types of programs, numbers of students served, and funding sources (in the areas of early childhood education, Native cultures and languages, English language for Native students, compensatory education, special education, gifted and talented education, retention/retrieval programs, vocational/technical, postsecondary, and adult education/adult literacy programs)

4. Native curriculum, including development, availability, and use of such materials in public schools; inclusion of Native cultural topics in normal academic curriculum across subject areas; and descriptions of how instruction addresses various learning styles of Native students

5. Involvement of Native parents, communities, and tribes, including state policies, laws, formal agreements, and practices regarding tribal sovereignty, tribal self-determination, and local Native control of education; partnerships among tribes, state departments, institutions of higher education, and local districts; actual involvement of Native groups in public school education

Dr. Demmert asked that the description of state policy and laws be expanded to include programs for Indians generally. For example, in Alaska there is a program offering 15 scholarships for Native students. Dr. Charleston indicated that the draft was being offered for consideration and that hopefully members would point out gaps and make suggestions. He also noted that the Task Force needs to address ways in which this information might be collected (surveys, community research, etc.). Dr. Demmert asked the group for other additions.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that some of the requests might be overlapping. He noted that some states already completed studies that included Indian data. We could ask for copies of these to see what they consist of. For instance, Minnesota recently completed a study on attributes. Dr. Swan suggested that Robert Parsely (sp?) in Helena could be asked for a report on Indian education in Montana.

Mr. Hill pointed out that the validity of such data might be in question --that self-identification was prone to producing "garbage" data and that simply repackaging bad data would also produce garbage. Mr. Tullis agreed, observing that there is a major problem with self-identification in Alabama-- that no member of their annually funded commission is Indian or has ever been on a reservation. Mr. Parisian said that in Montana teachers gathered such data by asking for a show of hands. Mr. Ely stressed the importance of coming up with some really reliable and valid data. He suggested that Dr. Bell share his list of 35 areas with the members and staff as a starting place. Dr. Bell then shared his notes and passed them on to the INAR staff.

Dr. Swan noted that much of the data that Dr. Bell was proposing, especially on employment, would be available in the 1990 Census, but that it was not certain when this data would be published. Mr. Hill wondered if there was an Indian Desk at the Census Bureau, and Dr. Swan said he thought there was one. Mr. Tullis reminded the group that the 1980 Census data was released in March 1988. The current law requires that data be available within 18 months, but first it has to go to Congress and then to other departments of the federal government. In this way, the Department of Education will get it long before it is available to the tribes. He added that if the Task Force were to take Dr. Bell's list and ask for data on Native Americans, it will be flawed because it will draw numbers of people who are not Native American in the sense that we are using but, rather, are Samoans or Hawaiians. The states think they will get more money if they have higher numbers, so they will count everyone they can. They have a terrible problem with this in Louisiana where everyone is now an Indian because of bills that are in the legislature. This year in Alabama, we have four times the number of Indians we had in 1980 for the same reason.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that state Indian education staff are sensitive to these data issues and that the Task Force needs to make a statement about useful data when we ask for it.

Mr. Tullis related his experience a few years back when he was trying to get this information from a local school, and the principal called a general assembly and asked his all-black student body for a show of hands as to how many of them would not mind if he classified them as Indians. They all raised their hands. He said that this was one of his most trying experiences and that it bothered him deeply that this school system received Title IV money and used it to buy T-shirts that said "I am proud to be an Indian" and a color TV for the staff lounge. Then we hear about schools like the one in Bethel that are desperate for a library!

Mr. Martin asked if the request for Native curriculum data was going to include higher education. Dr. Charleston indicated that the entire scope of Indian education was included.

The next document offered by Dr. Charleston for review was a Discussion Outline for use in organizing, collecting, and compiling data gathered from various sources and for use in organizing and structuring the commissioned papers, final report, and supplementary publications. The first page is a broad overview of the process and the rest is an effort to categorize topics and subtopics that we can address.

> Commissioned Papers will be organized to address specific sections of the discussion outline. These papers are expected to be substantial treatments of the assigned topics; they will each include an executive summary and recommendations for use in the final report.
>
> The Final Report will be a 50-60-page summary of key points, findings, and recommendations derived from the commissioned papers and other gathered data.
>
> Supplementary Publications is currently a loosely defined section but will probably consist of staff-edited and compiled commissioned papers. We would make these available to those who would like to explore issues in more depth.

It is hoped that the Task Force could agree on the general outline here in Juneau; then perhaps the staff can organize testimony sessions in San Diego to correspond with major focal points of the final report. Dr. Charleston indicated that the staff would like to produce a draft final report that the members could look at in sections as it evolves into a finished product. Dr. Beaulieu endorsed that process, saying that he preferred an evolutionary approach.

Dr. Swan wondered about accessibility of the commissioned papers and other data after 1991. He suggested that it would be very helpful to establish repositories of this information out in Indian country, particularly at colleges and universities. Dr. Ginsburg noted that all of the documents would be added to the ERIC system. Dr. Bell noted that after the Nation At Risk was published there was a tremendous demand for commissioned papers from colleges and universities around the country. He added that while 50-60 pages might be appropriate for the public document, others would want the report to include more detail. Dr. Charleston said that he viewed the product as similar to the one produced in Canada, which included a short public report and a volume of technical papers that were made available to the research community.

Mr. Hill wondered how the Final Report would be released. Would the Task Force follow the strategy used by the Carnegie Foundation when it released the Report on Middle Schools and coordinate with Education Week and Time magazine, etc.? Dr. Ginsburg suggested that once we have a report prepared, we will discuss its release with the Secretary in order to get a better sense of how best to do this. He also suggested that we might want another technical volume to compile public testimony. Dr. Beaulieu agreed with this suggestion because it would give those who came to testify a feeling of ownership in the process. Dr. Swan then proposed that a limit be placed on the time and the number of pages that would be accepted for testimony; perhaps five minutes to summarize testimony orally and a five-to-ten page limit on written submissions.

Dr. Charleston indicated that one concern would be how best to organize the testimony. Mr. Tullis suggested that it be part of the supplementary publication. Dr. Charleston noted that testimony and surveys are really part of "raw data." He views the papers in the supplementary publication as analyses of raw data. In any case, all of this will go into ERIC.

Dr. Bell stressed the importance of having writers who can really write. Dr. Demmert added "and meet deadlines." Dr. Bell suggested that the final product must really "sparkle in language, tone and structure!" Mr. Hill felt that 50 to 60 pages might be too long, and Mr. Tullis agreed that more would read it if it were shorter. Dr. Ginsburg said that the staff envisioned a text not much longer than A Nation At Risk but that the report would be made longer by the addition of artwork, photographs and sidebars which would contain examples. Dr. Beaulieu supported the idea of photographs because they are a good way to grab attention.

The Task Force was then asked to consider the more detailed outline of the final report.

Al Judson, who had testified on Monday and attended the Tuesday meeting, pointed out that there were many independent contractors who could contribute to the research effort but were not part of tribal groups. Dr. Charleston acknowledged this concern and said that the DOE was coming out in the Federal Register with a broad call for papers and reports. This call will also go out through NACIE, tribal newsletters, etc.; hopefully, in this way the request will generate broad input. He added that we need positive public press to convey the notion that we seriously intend to make a major contribution to improving Indian education. This is especially critical going into San Diego, so we will get meaningful testimony rather than a discussion on the validity of the Task Force.

Dr. Demmert recommended that Dr. Beaulieu's point about the historical influence of this type of report be restated and emphasized, from the Meriam Report on down to the present, listing them and describing their impact. Mr. Ely agreed that we needed to sell the public, from here, on the impact of reports issued in the past.

Mr. Sidney suggested that in writing the final report, we should write at a level that our parents can understand.

Dr. Demmert closed the session for a lunch break.

Tuesday, July 17, 1990 - Afternoon Session

Dr. Demmert reopened the session at 1:45 pm.

Bob Arnold asked to make a few comments as an observer. He first complimented Task Force members on the quality of their exchanges. He then said that he had a few observations to offer on the basis of what was heard in yesterday's testimony and from his experience working on the reform of education for Native Alaskans:

1. It will be helpful to note that some of the problems of Native students in Alaska were problems of children everywhere in America. He suggested that it would be helpful to see these a bit separately from those particular to Native Americans, especially regarding the design and targeting of solutions.

2. It will also be important to be very clear about the purpose of schooling as it relates to culture and tradition. Alaska Natives have concluded that they need to bring to the fore those values that are important over time. They have called upon their Elders to identify the values that have been most important in shaping their people. These are the values that should shape the curriculum as much as possible.

> If the community thinks through its values and the kinds of adult lives it wants for its children, this will have an impact on the choices for change and reform. In this process the group can line up "Inupiak" values with American values (cooperation vs. competitiveness, sharing vs. acquisitiveness). Educators and communities need to be explicit about the values being taught because if we are not, implicit ones will come to the fore.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that a study has been completed in Minnesota looking at a broad range of values indicators. This study included a "traditionality index" to help determine what respondents meant when they referred to tradition. It was found that traditional values require a traditional social context, one that is congruent with those values. For instance, if you proposed in a tribal council that an "old folks home" be constructed, everyone would vote for it out of respect for older people. Yet we have found a direct correspondence between absence of older people and violence in the community. So we need to think about the context schools provide by the way they are organized. Another illustration of this occurred as part of a National Indian Library:

> A young man collecting oral histories about traditions that were being lost approached an older woman to ask her to demonstrate and explain the tanning of deer hides in the old way. She did not want to do it, saying that it was "stinky, useless, and why teach it?!" She finally agreed under the condition that it be videotaped in the Lakota language, by the river, with a group of young people around her. In other words, the manner of sharing instruction with younger people was very important to her.

Mr. Hill agreed and added that "we don't want to go back 50 years, we like modern conveniences, but there are important values that transcend over time."

Dr. Demmert returned the discussion to the Draft Outline presented before the lunch break. In reference to the outline, he suggested that the Task Force take a broad look at the draft and then go through the document page by page to make specific recommendations. Dr. Ginsburg asked that members also think about one or two things that they each hope will distinguish this report and that they would like it to be remembered by.

Dr. Demmert shared questions that he had asked himself:

1. What can be done to stimulate schools to respond to the community; how can we, as a Task Force, stimulate change?

2. Should the focus be on improving academic performance, curriculum, etc., or on administration and management issues? He personally prefers to focus on academic performance.

3. How do we reach parents who don't care? As we look at recommendations for programs, we need to keep this in mind.

4. What is the proper role of states in the education of Indians and Native Alaskans as we look at the majority of kids in urban schools and the minority in isolated rural areas?

These questions might provide some focus for our discussion.

Dr. Beaulieu took issue with the either/or question regarding focus on academic performance or administration and management, saying that he did not see it this way. Both are important. There is a logic to getting a sense of where we've been in the last years and a sense of what current conditions exist. We have ideas about successful strategies and we know what barriers are out there. We have to respond to both identifying strategies that will work and identifying the barriers to their working.

Dr. Demmert responded that he sees administration and management in terms of organizational structure, including BIA and DOE, state structures, and so on.

Dr. Bell reflected that this entire issue reminded him of the landmark bills passed by Congress after studies, when he was U.S. Commissioner of Education during the Nixon-Ford years. When Congress passed Public Law 94-142 which provides education for all handicapped children, it was in part due to their outrage in response to what they learned in testimony. States were excluding students from schools with no good reasons. It was a tough law and it stipulated that "these children are special." This legislation includes a Bill of Rights, and I am thinking that American Indians and Native Alaskans also need a Bill of Rights.

Dr. Bell said he felt that as a result of this Task Force effort we should be able get a similar enactment from Congress. These children have clearly been discriminated against! Today in special education the local districts are scared to death of being found in noncompliance. I would suggest that we be remembered for producing a Bill of Rights for Indian children which includes specific development of a plan, spelling out who is to be involved, and so forth.

Dr. Demmert asked the group if the idea of an Education Bill of Rights for Indians and Alaska Natives is worth pursuing. The groups agreed with this idea. Dr. Demmert then asked Bob Arnold how responsive he felt the Senate would be to a well thought out report that puts forward a Bill of Rights. Mr. Arnold replied, speaking for the Select Committee, that he could more than surmise about their response. He believes that Senator Inouye would certainly welcome legislative and funding recommendations, as would other members of the Committee. He said he felt that they would be aggressive about seeking funding. Congress promised 40 percent and only provided 10 percent, yet states have still had to comply with the law.

Mr. Hill made reference to the "curse of Columbus," saying that the challenge was in shaping a common view between parents, students, teachers, administrators, and communities. He observed that if you looked at the history of the Five Civilized Tribes, before they became the state of Oklahoma, you can see their record of success. What were the factors that made their experience so successful?

Dr. Bell indicated that a legislative initiative would require special funds, the design of a plan for each individual Indian student, and a mandate for parental involvement with provision for a sign-off. At the time the special education legislation was passed, he thought it was an invasion of states' rights, but Congress felt that states would not take action if it were approached in any other way. Inouye could be a real ally in this initiative.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that it might not be necessary to model the legislation exactly after 94-142. Statements concerning "what Congress believes to be true" are assertions of need and could become the basis for changing state administrative thinking. Dr. Bell indicated that he was thinking about spelling out needs and rights.

Mr. Ely pointed out that Indian leaders have been working hard to move forward with our people and to accomplish things. Indian children are not "handicapped" in same sense that special education students are handicapped. We must be careful about the implications of this approach because it could become a crutch, and we could dig ourselves in deeper. You can count me out in terms of requiring a parental sign-off--parental involvement needs to be stressed, but it should not be mandatory for parents. This might just compound the problems, especially if we take an approach that implies this is another case "handicapped children."

Dr. Bell qualified his earlier remark, saying that he was really talking about a guarantee rather than a mandate. Mr. White said he felt it would be important to have outcomes that would show involvement of Indian people. The advantage of IEPs is that they provide a mechanism for legal accountability.

Mr. Ely commented that Indian people are at a critical turning point, which is why caution is advisable. Mr. Hill agreed but added that we are already in a big hole and a Bill of Rights could restore some dignity to children. They are exposed and they do need laws to protect them. If such a Bill of Rights were proposed, it would unconscionable for people to vote against it. We want legislation with "big teeth," and we could effectively organize our report around a Bill of Rights.

Dr. Swan indicated that he liked the Bill of Rights concept, but was bothered by talk about developing IEPs for students. In a school serving 500 Indian students, this procedure would require a much larger staff than most schools have. We have to remember all of the changes required in the 1970s by Titles IV and V and keep in mind that for the past 12 years we have been operating on constant 1978 dollars. We simply cannot buy in the 1990s what we were able to buy in 1978. A lot of growth and development has been stymied by this limitation.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the idea of IEPs is strategic, it is a means for solving a problem. But we do need to recognize in our document that Indians represent a unique case. We can make a statement about what is unique to the special needs of Indian education and assure that states recognize the same principles.

Mr. Lewis added that a statement of rights would go a long way toward clarifying the relationship between states and tribes, the federal government and states and tribes, and so forth. Confusion and lack of legislative mandates are causing people not to act. A Bill of Rights would provide the "teeth" needed and would stipulate a way for implementation where it needs to be mandated.

Mr. Sidney agreed that a Bill of Rights would be important, but he could also see Mr. Ely's point. As a Tribal Chairman you want to support what the tribe sees for its future. As a National Task Force, we have to be conscious of tribal governments sticking together and of their concerns regarding links to sovereignty and federal recognition of land rights.

Dr. Demmert suggested that there is a difference between social services that can promote a dependency and a "right" that allows certain things to happen. He shared a statement he had drafted:

> "As the original indigenous population of the United States, American Indians and Native Alaskans have unique languages and cultures found nowhere else in the world. The Federal government has a responsibility to protect and promote this heritage."

Mr. Martin cautioned that we needed safeguards to avoid stigmatization. Dr. Bell agreed and Mr. Ely suggested that it could even escalate racism if it were not done carefully. Dr. Beaulieu said that in Minnesota they had attempted to state things as "overriding concerns." He then read the first paragraph of their statement:

> "The State Board of Education hereby recognizes the obligation of the State of Minnesota to respond to the strong expression of the Indian people for self-determination by assuring maximum Indian participation in the field of education for Indian Tribes and communities so as to render services more responsive to their educational needs and desires."

Dr. Demmert asked if there was enough support for the idea of a Bill of Rights to ask the staff to develop a draft statement. The group agreed, and Dr. Bell asked that the cautions expressed by members of the Task Force be heeded.

Dr. Charleston noted that what we've been discussing here are ideal education plans, and it is clear that we would like to provide quality education. This needs to be developed, and perhaps a law will encourage schools to move beyond mediocrity. Dr. Bell added that, in fact, we are all concerned with doing this for all children, so let's show that we can provide quality education for these children. Mr. Tullis said it would be nice to get to a point where the public schools turn to BIA and Indian schools as a exemplary. This is a small enough population--it won't break this country to make the kind of investment we are talking about.

Dr. Beaulieu advised that we need to keep in mind the difference between having broad community social needs met by the schools versus meeting only educational needs, the former being the basis of tribal colleges.

Dr. Swan said that if Congress can spend $200 billion to bail out the savings and loan industry, surely they can find $200 million to bail out education. Dr. Charleston advised the group that a copy of SB 2512, the Bill for a New Federalism for American Indians, is included in members' packets and should be reviewed. We need to be well aware of this as a current Congressional consideration.

Dr. Ginsburg asked for confirmation of what the Task Force was asking staff to prepare. He indicated that he was hearing the following requests:

1. a draft Bill of Rights
2. development of a mechanism for their achievement--which may or may not include stipulation for measures like development of IEPs
3. development of a range of mechanisms to hold people accountable--which may include stipulation for development of school plans

Dr. Demmert confirmed that the staff should develop both a draft Bill of Rights and mechanisms for review by Task Force members at their next meeting.

Dr. Charleston then began to review the Draft Discussion Outline with members on a page-by-page basis. He indicated that the intent is to have a good flow from beginning to end. Comments for revisions followed.

Dr. Charleston noted that a piece on parental involvement should be added to Section II.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that more topics need to be added to Section II. A. We need to emphasize more recent responses, such as the Kennedy Report to demonstrate the struggle for development of ideas and the notion that we are riding a movement, that this is a part of what has been emerging over the recent past. This would set a context for our report and the way it fits.

Mr. Lewis suggested that in Section I.B.4., we need to suggest going beyond traditional forms of partnerships like PTA.

Mr. Ely wondered if the topics are prioritized, and Dr. Charleston indicated that they are organized as logical sequences rather than priorities. Mr. Ely wondered if the public would see the order as a prioritization. Dr. Charleston said that the order was primarily to serve as a guide to staff for structuring the work. Mr. Ely then said that we will have to make a statement that they are not priorities so this assumption will not be made.

Dr. Bell said that he did not want the outline to serve as the order of the final report. He stressed that the first five pages must be powerful. We need zingers in the beginning to capture the essence of our message. Dr. Swan indicated that he usually only reads the executive summary and the recommendations. Dr. Bell added that if you read the first words in A Nation At Risk they really come across forcefully; we will need attention-getter language like this.

Dr. Beaulieu asked if the outline were designed to structure the domain of the study. Dr. Charleston confirmed this, adding that we need to consider placement of topics early, so sections tie together and a draft can be produced early. Mr. Ely proposed that we view the draft now as an outline and discuss priorities after the hearings in San Diego.

Dr. Bell suggested that the foremost goal should be placed first. Dr. Swan felt that the report would run into problems if we presumed to determine the top educational goals and priorities--the tribal committees will react negatively. Dr. Beaulieu felt that we need to write at a level at which the tribes can react.

Dr. Demmert suggested that we need to write at two levels:

1. Recommending goals to the Secretary for the federal government focus
2. Providing an avenue for tribes to focus on their own priorities

Mr. Ely believed that it is probably too early to establish priorities because we have not yet heard enough public testimony. He also said that as far as public criticism was concerned, the Nation At Risk report has certainly been condemned in some quarters, and it is probably impossible to avoid this altogether.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that we might want to have handouts that would address the preliminary issues or a set of tentative goals. Mr. Ely agreed that one way to gather data would be to lay out our goals and let people who testify and other concerned groups prioritize them.

In looking at Section III, Dr. Swan urged that we address the issues of high expectations, educational leadership, and providing a safe school environment in urban schools. Dr. Charleston referred the group to Goal 8 on page five. Dr. Demmert thought that some of these issues could be articulated under "strategies." Mr. Ely agreed that higher expectations is a strategy. Mr. Hill asked that "community service" be added to educational leadership as a goal. Dr. Beaulieu noted that the emergence of Indian gangs is a serious problem in urban schools where there has been an increase in the level of violence, including Indian against Indian and Indians against Elders. Indians are participating in increased levels of violence, and gangs are a response to the need to feel safe. Dr. Demmert pointed out that the larger responsibility has to be to provide for a multicultural setting that is safe.

Mr. Lewis suggested that under strategies we might want to address (1) organizational change strategies that make a difference in addressing problems like self-destructive behavior, including teen pregnancy, youth suicide, and gangs; and (2) organizational change strategies that will bring about restructuring. Dr. Ginsburg noted that Section IV.B.5. on empowerment addresses these concerns, although it may not be strong enough. Dr. Demmert said that in his view "empowerment" addresses the ability to change, while "restructuring" is the result.

Dr. Bell suggested that Goal 1 might need to be literacy for Native Americans in their own language and in English; then Goal 2 could be math. Dr. Demmert agreed and also offered an alternative of placing the establishment of a learning environment first.

Dr. Beaulieu wondered where we would discuss the issue of communities establishing their own goals and how that would affect the role of government and the responsibility of schools. Dr. Charleston again referred the group to the section on empowerment.

Mr. Martin observed that high attrition in postsecondary education is discussed in strategies, but it does not appear in goals. Dr. Charleston indicated that perhaps Goal 5 could be expanded to accommodate this as well as leadership and community service. Dr. Ginsburg indicated that we could add a goal statement on postsecondary education. The oversight comes from using the national education goals as a base and their focus on elementary and secondary education. Mr. Hill added that we also need to include adult education. Dr. Swan said that research was needed in postsecondary education to evaluate what has been done to reduce attrition and recommend directions.

Dr. Charleston moved the discussion to a focus on the curriculum issue (page 8 of the document). Dr. Beaulieu said it was important to frame the issue within overall curriculum development approaches. We must look at how curriculum is developed in the mainstream. Dr. Demmert indicated that while we do need to focus on "content," "perspective" is equally important--the question of where do you start, from whose perspective?

Dr. Swan pointed out that it is no longer possible to use Title VII (within grade education) money for anything except transitional purposes (since 1986) and that it could not be used for saving languages and suggested the Task Force may need to recommend legislative changes in Title VII to enable this to happen. Dr. Demmert said that we must look at current research on the importance of developing a language base, especially the research which establishes the importance of using the home language as the best focus for such a base. The research indicates that this home language base is important both for improving general academic performance and for learning English or other languages. This may be an area where we should take immediate action. Dr. Swan pointed to the irony of being unable to study one's own language in elementary school and then being required to study a second language in high school.

Mr. Lewis wondered, with regard to postsecondary strategies, if any thought had been given to tying into existing higher education commissions in states to recommend state funding appropriations. We do see this tie-in with tribal community colleges, but what are the possibilities for pursuing it as a broader strategy? Dr. Beaulieu said that in Minnesota they must consult with these commissions.

Mr. Martin referred to page 14, item B.2., and suggested that the statement say "training of non-Natives and Natives" and that he would like to see a discussion of a model implementation strategy which is key to this.

Mr. White raised the issues of alternative certification. We may want to look at accreditation of BIA and private schools and the state role in this process as it relates to alternative certification. He asked if the group would be interested in looking at alternative certification for instructors only or also administrative personnel. Dr. Demmert said that we need to look at national movements in this area.

Mr. Lewis said that his organization is recommending that Zuni schools withdraw from the North Central Accreditation (NCA) system. We want to change our schools in the way we organize time and space, and we want to spend more time on certain topics. For instance, we want to schedule English language development for daily two-hour blocks. Yet we run into structural barriers with the accreditation system. There are also certification issues and areas where Zuni's goals do not match their accreditation forms. For instance, we have a staff position called "cultural counselors," but the only category we can use to account for these people is "other." We call them for guidance and the only thing we get out of NCA is "when will you pay your fee?" Our approach does not fit their system. Now that New Mexico is vastly improved, we will use their accreditation system. Nevertheless, we do have to look at alternative certification within the context of its impact on accreditation.

Dr. Demmert suggested that it would be interesting to tie in formal accreditation with receipt of federal funding. Dr. Beaulieu offered the idea of establishing an Indian Accreditation Team to address the issues of Indian students who are minorities in urban schools. Minnesota used a model from North Carolina for evaluation of postsecondary institutions because it was more appropriate to our purposes. This is discussed in the Minnesota papers included in Task Force members' packets. We have begun to discuss with NCA how they can accredit schools with the kinds of results they are getting with minority youth.

Dr. Bell indicated that this was also a problem with Pell Grants and student aid which must be given (by Congressional law) to schools that are "accredited." He referred to a scandal involving an organization called the "Lone Star State Barber College Accreditation Organization" that was set up specifically to accredit barber colleges that were established by the same organization. They were basically just ripping people off. So then Congress said that the accreditation associations have to be on a list approved by the Secretary.

Dr. Beaulieu pointed out that the criteria for accreditation evaluation have to be meaningful to Indian schools, then the response will also be meaningful. Dr. Charleston noted that in Canada payment of funds via tuition agreements are jointly approved by the tribe. Before funds flow to the public schools, the tribe must sign off.

Dr. Ginsburg indicated that in accreditation the current effort was to move toward more outcome-oriented standards. Dr. Beaulieu added that when you are trying to evaluate goals and mission statements, the link to funding builds in accountability and the evaluation has more meaning.

Dr. Demmert called for a short break.

Tuesday, July 17, 1990 - Afternoon Session - Continued

Dr. Demmert reopened the session by asking if there were any further comments on the Draft Outline. Dr. Ginsburg noted that we are still weak on the issues of job training and vocational education, and we need to look at examples of programs that are integrated with business.

Mr. Ely pointed out that we only have a couple of months between now and San Diego. With this in mind, perhaps we need to discuss goals and priorities now in order not to leave the staff hanging out there. Also, if the Bill of Rights is to be an outcome, we should get specific about this now also. Dr. Demmert recommended that the staff prepare a draft for distribution within one month. Then members would have some time to comment and prioritize. Dr. Ginsburg agreed with the proviso that there would be a number of holes for content to be provided later.

Dr. Beaulieu wondered if we had agreed that we have the authority to prioritize. If so, we should instruct the staff to arrange topics in a tentative priority order. Dr. Swan indicated that he did not feel comfortable with any prioritization yet and probably would not feel comfortable until after October and the San Diego hearings.

It was generally agreed that we are not ready to prioritize, but Mr. Ely asked that we remember that there would be limited time to do this after San Diego.

Mr. Ely further suggested that the discussion seems to be evolving around assumed goals which need to be clarified. For example, did we finish our discussion about accreditation? If we are seeking change or an alternative accreditation/certification system, why are we doing so, and what is our goal? He expressed feeling a bit adrift without clear goals.

Dr. Charleston asked that the group think overnight about whether they wanted the final report to be an academic treatment/presentation, or an instrument leading directly to significant legislation, as Dr. Bell suggested. He pointed out that the current outline does not have a section for recommendations.

Dr. Bell reaffirmed his notion that we should have a set of final "punch 'em in the nose" recommendations. Dr. Demmert observed that we will be picking up recommendations here in Alaska and all around the country.

The Task Force agreed that staff should develop a draft (leaving holes wherever necessary) for distribution to members prior to San Diego. The draft will include preliminary recommendations. Members will then have sufficient time to review and prepare feedback for sharing at the San Diego meeting.

Dr. Demmert then asked that the group focus its attention on the issue of commissioned papers so that topics could be finalized and authors recommended.

Dr. Charleston provided an overview of the draft document, "Commissioned Papers on Sections of Final Report Outline." Criteria for authors was reviewed, and the importance of selecting candidates with "demonstrated" ability to write well and meet deadlines was stressed. Dr. Charleston said that he hoped to have presentations available by the October meeting, because the staff is hoping to have a draft of the final report ready for review by the February meeting.

Discussion followed as members reviewed the topics and made recommendations for potential authors. In addition Mr. Hill suggested that in order to draw upon the resources of Elders, a traditional round-table discussion should be organized with a writer/transcriber (perhaps at one of the regional hearings). This strategy would be important, because a group of traditional people will have a very different perspective. Dr. Charleston recommended that we consider this strategy for San Diego. Mr. Tullis noted that a National Indian Elders Conference is scheduled for the week of August 13, 1990, and that this would provide a good opportunity.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that additional papers be added: Urban Indian Education and Desegregation, Public School Finance and Regulations (exploring the sources of all various pieces of funding and their actual impact).

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that half of Minnesota's Indian students are in urban schools; they have a 33 percent annual dropout rate; one-third of urban Indian students are in special education; and Indians have 10 times the average suspension rate. They also have the highest level of resources available, so what is going on? The Minneapolis school district has been under desegregation for 15 years, and this has had a negative impact on Indians. The desegregation policy is essentially structured for blacks and the message is assimilation. Indians are excluded from participating in Indian education, and services are not provided to meet their needs. One strategy that is under discussion would create an all-Indian magnet school. There is a wealth of ideas and strategies, but we cannot get anywhere because we are always running up against desegregation. We actually have two different thrusts: the heritage of Brown v. the Board of Education, on the one hand, and the heritage of Indian Education on the other. Unfortunately, they are mixing in a way that is not helpful to Indians.

Mr. Hill added that racism and disconnection are major urban education issues and that he would like to see a paper on these issues even if it stepped on someone's toes. He also noted that the issue of the role of traditional culture is left off the list. Dr. Demmert felt that this should be approached regionally. The difference in perspective between the Pueblo, Sioux, and Eskimo are very broad. We need to reflect these differences to move beyond stereotyping, and we need to pull these various perspectives together.

Dr. Swan suggested a paper on the issue of culture/fair testing. Dr. Ginsburg indicated that the Department is creating a high-profile group to reexamine Chapter 1 testing and that the Indian interest can be combined with this effort.

At 5:30 pm Dr. Demmert adjourned the session for the day.

Wednesday, July 18, 1990 - Morning Session

Dr. Demmert opened the session at 9:00 am.

Task Force staff reviewed logistical issues, including completion of time and travel documentation and hotel arrangements for San Diego, which will be made by staff member Manny Smith.

Dr. Ginsburg recapped staff tasks that had been agreed upon the previous day, including preparation of a rough draft of the final report, presentation of some of the papers, and a draft of an Indian Education Bill of

Rights. He also indicated that in order to report on recommendations for bilingual issues, the Task Force would need to get into a discussion with Bilingual Education about expanding opportunities for American Indians and Native Alaskans and stressing the fact that continuing development of Native languages is helpful and important.

In beginning to discuss the Issues Sessions for NIEA San Diego, Mr. Hill suggested that it would be helpful to solicit expert testimony for the hearings on key areas of interest to the Task Force.

Dr. Charleston presented two possible options for organizing the hearings:

Option 1:	Repeated sessions with Task Force members split into three separate rooms. Approximately 2.5 hours per topic.
Option 2:	Full Task Force present for all testimony in the same room. Approximately one hour per topic.

Dr. Swan noted that the proposal overlooks a few groups, most notably parents and the issues of parental involvement. Parents will be in San Diego in large numbers. Dr. Charleston indicated that this has been proposed as a part of the "partnership" issues, but that he agreed it had been underweighted. Mr. Lewis felt that there should be a hearing on the issue of Native Teachers and Administrators. Dr. Charleston proposed either replacing existing topics (or their repeat sessions) or further splitting the Task Force and adding a room to Option 1, in order to expand the agenda.

Mr. Ely wondered what would be done to accommodate those individuals who come to testify on a wide range of issues. Dr. Demmert responded that we had intended to try to hold testimony to 10 minutes per person. Dr. Charleston also suggested that an alternative strategy would be to use NACIE's format by having a microphone and letting the Chair direct a discussion on the topic. That way you could collect written testimony and hopefully avoid the tendency for people to repeatedly make the same points. Mr. Tullis felt that we would get more participation this way and draw a wider range of comments. Members agreed that the hearings would be structured as open discussions with a three-minute time limit at the microphone and that those who testify will be asked to submit written testimony (with 15 copies and a limit on the number of pages).

Mr. Sidney noted that students would be there and that the Task Force should also try to draw them into the discussions. Dr. Swan added that they are a vocal group, and we may need two sessions to accommodate them. He went on to say that approximately 4,000 are expected to attend NIEA and that the President and Barbara Bush have both been invited as keynote speakers. The White House has indicated that this is high on the President's agenda, but we won't know his schedule with certainty until mid-August. Mrs. Bush would speak on early childhood education. In addition, an invitation has been extended to Nelson Mandela. He is under considerable pressure now with ANC, so we are uncertain about his availability. Other speakers will include Congressmen Williams and Campbell and Co-Chairs of the INAR Task Force (Bell and Demmert). There is also a standing invitation to Cavazos, but he probably cannot make it this year.

Dr. Charleston indicated that a session on Elders would need to be added. Mr. Hill said that this would not draw the high political people, but that hopefully we could get some interesting input from traditional people.

Discussion followed on the feasibility of issuing special invitations for expert testimony. Dr. Swan felt that this would help us to hear from those experts who are really involved and do not have time to write a commissioned paper. Task Force members recommended names of some individuals who could be specially invited to comment on various issues.

Dr. Charleston raised his concern that with two days of scheduled testimony and one day devoted to a meeting, there might not be enough time to accomplish all of these things. Dr. Swan echoed his concern, saying that since part of this would running concurrent with the conference, he hoped that members would find time to attend at least some of the conference events as well, especially Saturday evening.

There was brief discussion on organization and structure of the hearings to cope with the anticipated large numbers. One suggestions was that there be a flashing light to advise people of the time limits.

Additional Testimony

Additional testimony was heard. (See INAR Alaska Regional Hearing.)

Wednesday, July 18, 1990 - Morning Session - Continued

There was brief discussion about the possibility of visiting a school program in the San Diego vicinity. Pyramid Lake was offered as a possibility.

Dr. Demmert moved the discussion to the issue of proposed regional and full Task Force meetings. Dates, locations, and possibilities were discussed, as well as which Task Force members would attend which hearings.

- The High Plains Region will hold the next hearings scheduled for August 20, 1990, at the Sheraton Hotel in Billings, Montana.
- The Southwest Region will hold its hearing in on September 12, 1990, in the State Legislature Hearing Room in Phoenix, Arizona.
- The Great Lakes Region will host its hearing on September 21, 1990, at the State Capitol Building in St. Paul, Minnesota.
- The Eastern Region will schedule hearings on October 2, 1990, in conjunction with the USET Meeting in Cherokee, North Carolina.
- The Plains Region hearings are tentatively set for October 11, 1990, at a site to be determined.
- The Northwest Region hearings will be coordinated by Joe Coburn of the Northwest Regional Educational Lab, in Portland or Seattle. This date has not been set.
- The Alaskan Region hearings will not be held because it is believed that the groups from across the state were well represented in testimony presented at this meeting.

Dr. Demmert then asked Task Force members for recommendations of successful projects and programs that could be showcased or highlighted as part of the Final Report. In addition to program recommendations, it was suggested that there might also be a need to highlight individuals and what type of individual makes a program work, since many excellent programs seem to be dependent on the person who initiates. Recommendations for key individuals were also made by Task Force members.

Finally the group discussed a few unresolved issues regarding the San Diego meeting. It was agreed that staff should arbitrarily assign members to different sessions and then members can review and ask for changes. Both Dr. Charleston and Mr. Ely stressed the point that there will be a major amount of information to collect and work to process in San Diego. It was agreed that the time planned is too short and that additional time should be scheduled without interfering too much in the Conference agenda.

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Third Business Meeting: October 17, 1990

San Diego, California

The third meeting of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force was held at the Town and Country Hotel in San Diego, California. Task Force members present included Co-chairs Terrel Bell and William Demmert, Joseph Ely, Byron Fullerton, Norbert Hill, Hayes Lewis, Bob Martin, Ivan Sidney and Janine Pease-Windy Boy. Staff members present included Executive Director Alan Ginsburg, Project Director Mike Charleston, and Deputy Director Gaye Leia King. Others in attendance included John Tippeconic, Director, Office of Indian Education; Randolph Beales, Special Assistant, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary; JoJo Hunt, Executive Director of NACIE; and INAR Commissioned Paper authors Margaret Connell-Szasz, Linda Skinner, Jon Reyhner, Alice Paul, Schuyler Houser, Bobby Wright, and Jerry Brown.

Morning Session

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 am by William Demmert. He began the session by asking that fellow Task Force members recognize Janine Pease-Windy Boy for her NIEA award as Indian Educator of the Year.

Dr. Demmert then noted that members were to cover a long agenda during this meeting and that every effort would be made to keep the discussion from bogging down or becoming sidetracked. Following a few preliminary remarks by members of the Task Force, Co-Chair Dr. Bell and the staff, the primary focus of the meeting would be to discuss the content and direction of the final report. All members have been provided with a first draft of the introduction to the report as a starting place.

Dr. Bell restated his concern that the Task Force consider very direct language for the final report; that it be designed for brevity and to really "tell it like it is." He noted that it is always easy to give in to the temptation of feeling that we need to put everything into this report. The shorter the report the more widely it will be read and the more influence it will have. He said he had read the draft introduction and felt it was too long, although it would be difficult to determine where to make cuts. He again urged that the Task Force produce a short and powerful report that will be read and have influence. So many of these reports only gather dust on a shelf.

Dr. Ginsburg noted that Hayes Lewis had requested that an additional hearing be held in Albuquerque. Mr. Lewis explained that many tribal leaders were unable to make the regional hearing in Phoenix, that a number of those who were there were unable to get on the schedule to testify. There was a strong sense that another hearing was needed and the suggestion was that it be held in conjunction with the NCAI Conference, November 12-13, 1990. He further offered to facilitate such a hearing.

Mr. Sidney voiced his support for this hearing and indicated that he felt it would be responsive to the interests of people in that region. Dr. Ginsburg suggested that such a hearing might also provide an opportunity for an additional Task Force meeting to review a fuller draft of the final report, based on feedback gathered from this meeting. He noted that this had not been budgeted, but that ED would try to find a way to do it.

Dr. Charleston said that NCAI planners were excited about the prospect of the INAR Task Force holding a hearing at their meeting and that they would be welcome. He added that Monday of the NCAI schedule was to be centered on Veteran's activities and that Tuesday would therefore be a better day to schedule the Task Force hearing.

Mr. Ely expressed his view that the hearings already held have generated a substantial amount of material; that the Task Force has announced its interest in receiving additional written testimony; and that the nation has already been well covered. He felt uncertain that another hearing would generate anything new and felt that it would not be really necessary. His preference would be to allow Mike Charleston this time to prepare a more complete draft of the final report so that Task Force members can sit down and discuss it.

Mr. Lewis shared his belief in the importance of providing an opportunity for tribal leaders who would be in New Mexico to voice their concerns, needs, and recommendations which were not really heard in Phoenix. If we want success, this tribal voice is crucial because they are the ones who will carry the message back to their people. They must feel that they have participated and been heard in order to be supportive of our final recommendations. Rather than formal hearings, we might want to conduct discussions in a forum similar to that used in San Diego.

Mr. Ely then proposed that, if there was no urgency, the Task Force should also arrange to collect input from nonprofessional groups who were not well represented at Conferences (particularly parents and students) who might be more willing to come forth if hearings were held on the reservation. Although, if the Task Force was to do this, it would probably be wise to postpone the schedule for drafting the final report. Otherwise it would be like voting in California for President, when the results have already been determined in the East.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy felt that work on the report should progress, but that the credibility of the Task Force depends on support from tribal leadership. While it is likely that many issues will be repeated, it is equally likely that new issues will be raised. With the availability of word processing technology we should be able to incorporate new concerns in a timely manner. She also indicated that she wasn't sure she agreed with Mr. Ely about going out to the reservation. She noted that NIEA was by nature a parent, student, and educator conference, and that all of these groups had had an unusual opportunity to come before the Task Force over the past two days. She advocated proceeding concurrently with efforts to draft the report and with holding an additional hearing in Albuquerque.

Mr. Hill added his view that the hearing in Albuquerque would be important, particularly in light of the BIA's recent experience there when it announced its reorganization plans. He noted that this was the first committee he had served on without Navajo representation. The Navajos are a very large tribe and this would give the Task Force an important opportunity to hear their voice. We need to be there to take their testimony.

Dr. Ginsburg observed that with the White House Conference scheduled for Fall 1991; the linkages established through Ivan Sidney's role as Chair of the Conference and John Tippeconnic's role in coordination; and with the Task Force's desire that its report "drive" the conference, it would be essential that the report be issued as originally scheduled to allow time for it to gestate in the field. He strongly urged that the report not be delayed.

Mr. Sidney indicated that he and Dr. Ginsburg had discussed the linkages between the Task Force and the White House Conference. They had both agreed that it would not be in anyone's best interest to hold the Conference and then hold more hearings. He granted that there was not much time, but said he felt that the Task Force could not err by holding too many hearings. By holding hearings in Albuquerque the Task Force would also be involving itself with another large Indian organization, and it is important to extend the credibility of the process in this way. The more involved we are with national organizations the better chance they will support our findings and recommendations. We all have a responsibility to talk to people in our regions and hear their concerns. I have been talking with the Navajo and they are very interested in having us hold these hearings.

Dr. Demmert proposed that the Task Force arrange to meet in Albuquerque to hold information meetings rather than a hearing. We could then present a summary of what we have found so far, as well as the outline and content of our report. This will give participants an opportunity to respond, and it will also put additional pressure on the writers to pull their drafts together. This might be even better than a hearing because it would allow us to get feedback on what we are doing. We need an interim meeting because we don't want to go too far in our report without getting feedback. The content is ours but with 15 of us it may take some time to negotiate the details.

Dr. Bell asked if the Task Force was anticipating unanimous support of the report by all its members. Dr. Demmert said no, but the more areas where agreement could be reached, the better. Dr. Bell then asked if there was a plan to publish a minority report. Dr. Demmert again said no, not unless it was wanted. Dr. Bell pointed out that these were big issues. He recalled that they had had a "big brawl" over the Nation At Risk Final Report and consequently had postponed its release for a month despite having an appointment with the President. The Chair insisted on unanimity, and it took a month to resolve our differences.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy worried that if we present an outline, the feedback in Albuquerque would be "reactive" rather than formative and would be likely to draw the kind of response the BIA often generates. Such an approach does not elicit positive and creative input. Unless my sense of timing is wrong, I don't think it will be too late for creative input. Are we in a formative or reactive stage?

Dr. Demmert indicated that in his view the process was in a formative stage through Albuquerque and even the first of the year. Dr. Bell then asked if a draft release would hurt the impact of the final report or take the edge off its release in May.

Mr. Ely agreed with Ms. Pease-Windy Boy that to release a draft would be ill-advised. It would be likely to generate the same kind of response it usually does. People would ask themselves, "Why am I even here?" They would feel that the government was doing what it has always done: asking for Indian opinion when they have already made a decision. He urged that the Task Force be very careful about releasing a draft if other hearings are to be held.

Mr. Lewis agreed and observed that this same issue had been discussed at length in Juneau, and Task Force members had shared their discomfort with determining the content of the final report early in the process. If we know what we are going to say, why hold another hearing? We need to provide an opportunity for leaders to express their needs in a way that they feel is most appropriate and we need to keep the process as formative as possible.

Dr. Demmert then wondered about presenting a summary of the information we have gathered so far as a basis for discussion.

Mr. Ely made a motion that the Task Force hold a hearing in Albuquerque at NCAI and accompany this with a Task Force meeting to allow members to look at progress-to-date on a draft of the final report. Mr. Hill called for the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Bell then raised a question he wanted resolved before the discussion continued. "Is it the intent of the group that we keep a tight wrap on the report or that we leak it?" Often in Washington people will send up a trial balloon to get a preliminary response. But this needs to be agreed upon, because if we aren't careful, it will be leaked or at least some aspects of it will get out.

Dr. Charleston indicated that he felt most comfortable with developing the report as if it were soft and could be molded in the public view. Through the hearing process we are intentionally making ourselves open so that this is a report of and by our people. It is important in our community to listen to our people and validate with feedback that our recommendations are appropriate. Therefore, it will be most comfortable to do it all in the public eye and not hit them in the end with a report that appears to be a proclamation from the federal government.

Dr. Ginsburg agreed with that general direction, but expressed his concern that people will look at the report for their favorite area and ask that it be added if they don't see it. This could result in the report ballooning. Although we can probably accommodate most concerns at the macro level, it would be hard to do so at a micro level. This will have to be a Task Force decision.

Mr. Ely agreed with Dr. Ginsburg. We are assigned to draft the report and we are making every effort to get input from as wide a constituency as possible. We do need broad support from Indian people, but there may be some pieces that are not universally palatable and we would be under pressure to delete them. I propose we stick to our agreement in Juneau and proceed to draft the report. We can then look at it as a Task Force report and bring it out to the public when we have agreed on its content. If we will have trouble reaching consensus among ourselves as a Task Force, it will be nearly impossible to do so with the public.

Dr. Bell asked if members viewed the report as an expression of the Task Force or as a mirroring-back of the view of the Native American community. Whichever approach we take will determine the report. If it is intended to mirror-back the community--and there is a virtue to this type of report--we really need the skills of George Gallup and we should be doing some polling. If, on the other hand, we prepare it as a Task Force report, then we say that we've held hearings and deliberated, and these are our recommendations.

Mr. Fullerton said that he favored the trial balloon approach because it was a form of polling. If we just issue a report without feedback, we won't be doing our job. We certainly can't satisfy everyone, but I thought this was how things are traditionally done in Washington.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she placed more faith in a participatory process where there is plenty of sunshine. Our effort has been this way so far and we have laid a wealthy foundation of sunshine. However, we may want to target those from whom we wish to receive feedback on our draft final report. If we proceed as we have begun, we should be close to the mark, but if we keep it away from the Indian education community, we would be perceived as withholding, and the report will be suspect. Dr. Bell asked if she then favored releasing a draft report and receiving input. She answered that she favored soliciting feedback from a selected group.

Dr. Bell then asked if the report would be presented as "the views we heard" rather than "our views." Dr. Demmert felt that the report would be presented as a synthesis of "what we have heard" and "our recommendations."

Mr. Hill expressed his concern that, as a parent and an educator, he and the others are in a position of trust with our own communities; we are empowered by our people to carry their message forward. I therefore feel an obligation to integrate and mirror-back the concerns that we have heard. We want to reflect what people have said, so I favor releasing an interim or preliminary report to see if we are on the mark. I like the sunshine approach. As a member of this Task Force, I don't represent the Administration or the Department of Education; I represent my people--past, present, and future generations--and it is a significant challenge for all of us not to screw-up. I think we can come to consensus.

Mr. Sidney agreed with the importance of the sunshine approach. It is the perception of Indian people that public policy will directly affect them. If it is developed in a closet, they will trash it and this will again set up a victim mentality. If we set-up a mechanism for feedback, we can keep it at the formative stage as long as possible. I don't think it will be that difficult to come to agreement on a report. We may not agree on every detail, but I feel we can draft a report that we can all support and carry back to our people.

Mr. Sidney went on to express his confidence in the staff of the Task Force and to assure Task Force members that whatever we do, we will be able to look to the White House Conference to implement our policy recommendations. As a former tribal leader, I can tell you that tribal people have never been in consensus and this is a big problem, but we do need to bring our ideas before the leaders and get their feedback so that we can do justice to a unified approach. Mr. Hill added that members could disagree without losing respect and still ultimately arrive at consensus.

Dr. Charleston shared his major concern that the foundation of ideas and recommendations come from the Indian community through the Task Force, so that they reflect the ideas of Indian people rather than the Department of Education and the federal government. He added that he currently felt caught in between the two and was feeling considerable pressure to follow the rigorous guidelines and concerns of the government. We are now at the third meeting of the Task Force and we have not had the opportunity for the Task Force members to discuss the key issues in depth. We have had very little chance to share and discuss the ideas generated by the Task Force members with the public. I want to push for a final report that reflects the voice of the Task Force members and the many Indian people who have contributed to the process, but I feel a serious conflict between that desire and pressure to reflect the positions of ED. If the final report does not reflect Indian perspectives it will simply be a continuing chapter in the history of paternalism that has characterized the relationship of our people with the federal government.

Dr. Demmert proposed that today's meeting be one of several opportunities ahead to discuss issues that will go into the report. I agree with the need to develop the report in a public fashion and I particularly agree with Janine's suggestion that we identify individuals and groups from whom we would solicit feedback at least on certain parts of the report. We have the ultimate responsibility to determine what is included and excluded, but if we don't develop a sense of ownership in the Indian community, we will have a tough time selling our recommendations. I disagree with Mike Charleston in terms of the history of our relationship with the government regarding education. The Kennedy Report was not done in isolation; it was a very open and successful process.

Dr. Charleston indicated that his remark had been a reference to the broader history of the executive branch of the federal government and the conflict that is inherent in the executive branch administering Indian affairs on behalf of Indian people in a manner acceptable to the Administration rather than being supportive or responsive to the concerns of Indian people. He agreed that Congressional inquiries such as the Kennedy Report have been very responsive to Indian concerns and have been very productive.

Dr. Demmert asked how they might proceed to resolve these issues opened by Dr. Bell. Dr. Bell said he thought he had heard a consensus based on what had been said so far around the table. Dr. Demmert restated his interpretation of the group's consensus that (1) the process be public, (2) selected individuals and groups be targeted to respond to the report in part or in its entirety, and (3) the Task Force review this feedback and then publish its final report. I don't hear agreement with Norbert Hill's suggestions that we publish a preliminary report.

Mr. Ely agreed with Dr. Demmert's restatement of the issues. There were no further objections. Dr. Demmert asked that the minutes reflect this agreement.

Mr. Lewis raised his concern that the process Dr. Charleston was encountering on a day-to-day basis may be restricting in some way the staff's ability to go forward. He asked that Dr. Charleston elaborate on his earlier remarks.

Dr. Charleston explained his concern that the development of Task Force materials and processes is done internally without communicating with the Task Force members. His preference would be to submit materials to the Task Force for their review and input from this point forward. At present materials are reviewed in an almost censorial way up through the Deputy Under Secretary's Office. Of course, this process is important, but the Task Force also needs to be in the loop. For example, we have heard from Task Force members and at hearings that we need to propose legislation or legislative changes, yet that word is not found in any of our Commissioned Papers because the position from ED is not to move in this direction. This type of issue needs to be decided by the Task Force. Some of the issues we are dealing with are complex and difficult--such as Impact Aid--and the INAR staff shouldn't be making recommendations without the support and decision of the Task Force.

Dr. Bell reaffirmed his belief that the Task Force does not have a responsibility or obligation to run its final report past Ted Sanders, Lauro Cavazos, or the OMB staff before it is issued. As I understand it, we were appointed as an independent body to bring out our report and make our recommendations. I say this as a Republican with the warmest feelings toward our Administration. But I surely hope that we don't feel obliged to get feedback regarding our consistency with Administration policy. In fact, I asked Lauro Cavazos about this when I was asked to serve on this Task Force. The Nation At Risk panel absolutely refused to let me look at one word or sentence of their report before it came out. That is how fiercely they felt about their independence.

Dr. Demmert indicated that Dr. Bell was speaking for the Chair at this point.

Dr. Ginsburg said that he was in full agreement that the report should not come from the Department of Education. He pointed out the possibility that the Secretary might reject the report in part or entirely, but assured members that it is to be a Task Force report. That is why we can't go forward without Task Force agreement. The compromise that had been agreed on was really a strategic action plan reflecting an ED concern that "contractors" (i.e., authors of Commissioned Papers) not be asked to write legislation. They are each dealing with only portions of the whole picture and are not in a position to debate the trade-offs between budgets. This does not mean that the Task Force is not free to write its report without a review process.

Dr. Demmert suggested that as drafts are developed, Task Force members be given an opportunity to review and comment, and when we are comfortable with them that is fine.

Dr. Ginsburg also pointed out that this was the Secretary's idea and no one forced him to establish the Task Force. He talked with Secretary Lujan, decided there was a need, and went forward with it out of his own concerns. So the Task Force is certainly independent and free to publish its views.

Mr. Ely agreed with Dr. Ginsburg that members should keep in mind the fact that the Secretary had come forward and established this opportunity to make national recommendations. We must keep in mind the charge that he gave us, and we must remember that this report lives and dies by Administrative and legislative approval. We have to be realistic and we also have to tell the unvarnished truth. We must identify our goals and bring the Administration and Congress along so that we can implement our recommendations and make good our process so that the report won't sit on a shelf. I fully support bringing out drafts for both the Task Force and ED to review. Certainly if ED reviews a draft, we should also review it.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy expressed concern that some of the terms heard in hearings have been diluted in the summaries. For example the terms "parental control" versus "parental involvement" represent major differences in policy and how policy is applied by legislatures; they are not simply euphemisms. If this Task Force is not to have a fundamental impact, then I am not interested. Policy is legislation and I can't imagine that we would back away. I want to hear ideas before they are reviewed or censored by ED or I am not doing my duty as a Task Force member. I want to hear the "straight poop" and I want to hear where fundamental pressure points are. If fundamental change could be politically charged, this may be hard for ED, but they still need the courage to look at it.

Mr. Hill stressed his belief that project and ED staff are assigned to be responsive to the Task Force rather than the reverse. He also suggested that before the final report is released, the Task Force should meet with Lauro Cavazos and gain his support.

Dr. Demmert asked if there was consensus on these points. Members agreed and Dr. Demmert asked that the minutes reflect this agreement. He then called a ten-minute break.

Morning Session - Continued

Dr. Demmert reconvened the meeting at 10:30 am, indicating that discussion of the report would continue after introduction of authors, comments from John Tippeconnic, and discussion regarding some concerns of Norbert Hill.

Dr. Charleston noted that a number of the Commissioned authors were in attendance at the meeting and indicated that the Task Force had been very pleased to have the authors at the Issues Sessions held Monday and Tuesday. The issue sessions had given them an opportunity to hear people share their concerns and hear the feeling and emotion that is often not conveyed through written accounts of testimony. Their presence at the Task Force meeting also provided an opportunity to hear members' concerns and a chance for members to meet authors and establish a dialogue. He noted that nine out of 21 papers have been funded and that detailed information on all of the papers was included in conference packets. Each author then introduced him or herself and indicated which paper they would be writing:

Dr. Margaret Connell-Szasz, University of New Mexico, Department of History

Commissioned Paper No. 2: Current Conditions in Native Communities

Dr. Alice S. Paul, University of Arizona, Tucson Early Childhood Education Model

Commissioned Paper No. 4: Strategic Plans for Early Childhood Education in American Indian/Alaska Native Communities

Ms. Linda Skinner, Choctaw, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Commissioned Paper No. 5: Strategic Plans for Incorporating Native Languages and Native Cultures in the 'Curricula of Elementary and Secondary Education

Dr. Jon Reyhner, East Montana College, Billings, Montana

Commissioned Paper No. 7: Strategic Plans for Dropout Prevention and Special School Support Services for American Indian/Alaska Native Students

Mr. Schuyler Houser, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, co-author with Dr. Bobby Wright, Pennsylvania State University (arrived later in the morning)

> Commissioned Paper No. 8: Strategic Plans for Improving Access, Retention and Graduation of American Indians/Alaska Native Students in Tribally Controlled Community Colleges.

Dr. Jerry Brown, Salish-Kootenai/Souix, Interface Network

> Commissioned Paper No. 17: Strategic Plans for Reading and Language Arts Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indian/Alaska Native Students

Dr. Demmert then asked John Tippeconnic to address Task Force.

Dr. Tippeconnic began by expressing his appreciation for the opportunity to come before the Task Force for this first time. As you all know, I am the Director of the Office of Indian Education (OIE) within the Department of Education. OIE is responsible for administration of the Indian Education Act of 1972 and its Reauthorization of 1988. The 1988 Reauthorization language also assigns me, as Director, responsibility for working on coordinated activities within and outside ED.

As you also know, OIE has been without leadership for the past ten years. So I am coming in at a point where lots of work needs to be done. The legislation is changed, but the fundamental interests are still there. I will be looking to the Task Force for some guidance as we begin to look at this legislation in the light of changing times.

With our budget of $75 million we are a small program within ED, but across all programs approximately $530 million goes to education of Indian people. We feel we must be involved in the whole picture and we will be looking to your recommendations to improve Indian education through OIE.

The White House Conference on Indian Education was also authorized in the legislation and it was to be held no later than September 1990. It is now moving along. Mary Mc Clure, Special Assistant, attended the Tribal Leadership Conference in Albuquerque and announced that the White House Conference will be held in 1991. The next step is that Secretaries Cavazos and Lujan will accept nominations to an advisory committee. The Federal Register notice is currently being drafted to solicit these nominations. A Task Force has been jointly appointed from Interior and ED. These people will be 100% on the Task Force and will be paid out of the budgets of both Departments. Ed Sontag is the Acting Director of the Task Force. The three appointees from ED are Irving Jones, Ollie Abrams and Rachel Widdington. Benjamin Atencio has been appointed by Interior from the BIA. INAR Task Force member Ivan Sidney has been nominated to serve as Director of the White House Conference. The effort is to be housed at Interior and planning is now under way.

There are, however, two issues that create uncertainty. (1) We are unsure of the Conference budget situation. Approximately $500,000 has been approved as "no year money," and $493,000 of that is now available to get things off the ground. Our intent is to put together a Conference that is well thought out and takes into consideration many aspects of consultation: work of the INAR Task Force, BIA Mini-Summits, Tribal College efforts as documented by Carnegie and Norbert Hill's dialogues on Indian Education. We don't want to duplicate other efforts because this would be counter productive. The work of the INAR Task Force is therefore key and we also want to build in local involvement. The structure is complex with nominations for the advisory committee set-up as a joint effort between the Departments and the Administration. (2) Timing is also an issue. There is concern about the September 1991 target date allowing us enough time to pull it off in a way that makes a difference.

In sum, the Conference has been announced, it is under way, but budget and timing are potential issues. Our chief concern is that it be a joint effort. We have accordingly spent time putting the administrative structure together. It is critical that it be viewed as a joint effort.

Dr. Demmert thanked Dr. Tippeconnic for his remarks and asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mr. Hill inquired, for the record, if there will be a link between the government and tribes regarding education. In the context of contemporary issues which are now largely defined by the situation in the Middle East and the recession, is there going to be more money overall for education, let alone for Indians? We have to bear this in mind and we would like to ask Terrel Bell to ask President Bush to help with the release of this report, especially with the White House Conference coming up. Perhaps he could use his charm and influence to bring this about.

Dr. Bell said he would be happy to try although he is not entirely sure how much charm and influence he has.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that the Task Force had been criticized on several occasions for not having enough women among its members. Women are such a major part of Indian Education, she expressed hope that they would be represented in visible leadership positions on the White House Conference committees. Hopefully we will not keep repeating this same mistake.

In that same area of Task Force membership, Dr. Demmert wondered if we had ever heard from Robert Coles. Dr. Ginsburg indicated that we had never heard from him and that this was really their call. Dr. Demmert said that he would be going to Harvard next week and would try to talk with Coles to clarify his intent.

Dr. Demmert then moved the discussion on to the content of the final report. He asked that members begin by providing feedback on the tone and content of the draft introduction.

Dr. Bell asked if these would be the first words read as the report is opened. If yes, he also wanted to know if this would be the first sentence. Dr. Ginsburg said that the draft was intended to be some type of overview or introduction. Mr. Hill confirmed that the issues really are "survival" issues and that he had no disagreement with the first sentence. Dr. Demmert indicated that members should not feel concerned about his ownership of the piece--that he was completely open to redoing it at their suggestion.

Mr. Fullerton said he felt it was a little lengthy and possibly should be cast in a more positive light, although he took no issue with the content. He added his concern that the major thrust ought not to be for more funds. We ought to recognize the importance of funds, but should it be a major focus?

Mr. Ely indicated that he felt the tone of pages 1-3 was good and important. This states where the problem lies and it is important to highlight the issue of survival by placing it at the very beginning. After that the piece starts to drag out and needs to be tightened. He agreed that the emphasis should not all be on funding in the introduction. This paints a very big target for shooting at the federal government and overshadows others that should be included. Furthermore, the Task Force must be very careful when talking about going through Congress with an American Indian/Alaska Native Bill of Rights. Somewhere in the report we should discuss ways to implement it, and there we can talk about a Bill of Rights. In summary, (1) we do need to hit hard in the beginning and therefore we should make it more brief; (2) we should be identifying all parties who may be responsible (including the federal government); (3) we should allude to a Bill of Rights, but not spell it out; and (4) we should not focus all of our effort on funding.

Mr. Lewis agreed with the direct language and the proactive tone used in describing the needs and recommendations. He suggested that the introduction needs to stress a shared responsibility between the federal government and the tribes. We should acknowledge hardships, but not be "whiney" about them--we have to recognize that we all have responsibility. He agreed that it was a bit lengthy in its present form and could be combined and condensed. It is important, however, to state that American Indians and Alaska Natives are struggling in a battle for survival.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she too had enjoyed the first three pages and that they were very powerful. She expressed her concern that we needed data where Indians are compared to other sectors of the population. Indians are under-educated and this needs to be recognized in concrete terms by those outside Indian education. It is startling to realize how under-educated we are and this needs to be addressed in various places: in terms of literacy; and at early childhood, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.

She also suggested that there need to be networks to link the levels that share responsibility for delivering education: parents, local schools, state education agencies, the BIA, legislators, policymakers, and churches. There should be ways to focus our message and address it to the audiences that need to listen. We need to speak out about the policy that has gotten us here, where we are today. We need to speak to the roots of the problem and distinguish between fundamental format of ED and the way we work.

Mr. Ely asked that in the revision Indian people not be portrayed as victims. He said that he was sick and tired of that approach and that we need to get past it.

Mr. Hill pointed out that some of the tragedy is a reality and we must talk about it. He added that there has been a lot of talk about Indian education, but nothing gets done, so we need to talk about responsibilities. He observed that there is no "nice way" to say that 50 to 60% of Indian students won't graduate from high school, but we can use these facts to contribute to a counterpoint. I think we should convey that an agenda must be set and controlled by Indian people and that we need support. Money is important. The Department says that it is committed; the President says that he is committed. In reality, "commitment without cash is counterfeit." I don't think we should worry about asking for money. I like the Bill of Rights and feel that here is where we will find common ground in talking about the language, values, and cultural traditions of our people. A Bill of Rights can be framed and put in every classroom, so we know we have these things in common. A Bill of Rights can be a preamble or a forerunner to legislation that can be formed later. We need to convey a sense of excellence and of hope.

Mr. Martin said that he knew the Task Force wanted to be brief and not redundant and that in this vein, he had identified some problems on page six. The theme throughout the introduction is a lack of culturally relevant curricula. The integration of multi-cultural curriculum needs to be more clearly stated in the introduction. He also asked if #1 on page six could be strengthened.

Mr. Fullerton noted that he might perhaps be naive; that obviously he is not an Indian, although he has been interested in Indian education issues all of his professional life. He agreed with Norbert Hill regarding fundraising. Part of the job I've had has involved fundraising. Essentially this report is a fundraising pitch because we need more money. But with this sort of pitch it is important to be able to tell people what they will get in exchange, and it must be on a positive level. You have a number of people struggling for survival and their lives are being wasted because of lack of support and programs. Give the idea that the nation as a whole will benefit and make it such an appealing concept that no one will disagree.

Dr. Demmert agreed that this was a very important piece that needs to be added.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she was impressed with the testimony from the hearings and with the presentations from the issues sessions over the past two days. There is a tremendous amount of knowledge and a lot of professionalism among Indian educators and this is a "point of light." There are people out there who know what they are doing and they are succeeding. We can rest some laurels on our Indian leaders and parents and we can apply what we know. However, there are pervasive themes of "access" and "equity" and these two need to be recurrent themes in our document. We don't necessarily have to be so forceful about funding because we can realize some equity and access through reorganization and re-prioritization. Based on the data, these are two things that are not yet reality.

Dr. Demmert agreed that these points had been missed and that there must be recognition of the tremendous knowledge that is out there among professional Indian educators.

Mr. Hill noted that 1991-1992 constituted a "window of opportunity" for the Task Force to capture American attention. If we go into 1993 we will have passed this window, so we need to utilize a marketing approach. The first 3 to 4 pages must be compelling. I have no problems with "bleeding with dignity," but we also need to offer some solutions. I keep remembering the woman in Seattle who said it had taken her 17 years to complete her bachelors degree. She began to have difficulty speaking and we thought she might be suffering from asthma, but then realized that she was crying as she tried to talk about all of the problems of the children she works with. I don't want to be hearing this kind of painful story again in the year 2000. We have an opportunity to make a statement, and it is our responsibility to make it very compelling.

Mr. Sidney referred to the need for change, saying that everyone talks about the need for more money. I want to see a report where both Indians and legislators will agree with our main points. We all know the issues, the purpose of this document is to bring about change, so it must be targeted to the Hill and the people who will make this possible.

Mr. Lewis noted that one quality that characterized the hearings was a sense of urgency. It was not hysteria, but rather a sense of "when in the hell are we going to really do something about these problems?" "When will we get to enjoy some of the benefits of this society if we can't even get on the agenda?" Parents and children need to get something out of this effort. I feel we should identify the problems up front and then end on a more proactive note. We should say that these are the conditions we have endured and we must then convey a sense of urgency that something be done to bring about change.

Dr. Bell reminded members that he was the one who brought up the Bill of Rights idea in Juneau. Federal policy is reflected in legislation and the same thing is true at the state level, like the laws in Minnesota that provide for the education of Indian children. I tried to compare this idea to the federal law that compels that things be done for those children who are classified as handicapped. That law requires that we go out and identify and serve handicapped children. It recognizes that those children are special and if you don't comply with the law you can get in trouble and be hauled into court. The testimony that carried this law through Congress was about very bright children who were being kept out of schools. The law also requires that handicapped children must have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) designed to assertively serve their special needs. When Congress passed this law it promised to provide 40% of the funding. In fact it never has allocated more than 10%, and the burden is therefore on the states. The law stated that it was a nationwide shame that these children were not being served.

As we have heard people testifying in these hearings, we have heard about this population that was here before any of us Europeans, Africans or Asians ever arrived...these people lived here thousands of years before Columbus ever "discovered" America. Native Americans represent less than 1% of the total population, so a little money would go a long way. If $75 million only provides $250 per child this is too little to meet their needs. We should require school districts to assertively identify Indian children, identify their rights as a special population, and mandate that school districts look out for those rights. I don't want to belabor this, but I hope our report will come through with a strong appeal like that.

Maybe too much money goes into the Bureau. We ought to use every dime that is available for those precious children. After all, when you educate a child, you make a taxpayer out of a tax eater--one who will pay back many times over what we have provided him. So we will save the taxpayer a heck of a lot of money if we do this. Indian children are just as entitled to special services, yet if they are not required by law, school districts won't bother. If we require this we will render a great service.

Dr. Tippeconnic shared his view that the content is most important, but that the format must consider who will be reading the report. It needs to be put in a format so people get the message and it sparkles. In that regard, we need to hang our hats on a concept that will jump out. The Kennedy Report drew public attention to a "national tragedy." What is our fundamental concept? Will it be "survival" or a "Bill of Rights?" The Nation At Risk was so successful and could be found on everyone's desk because it was brief with clear basic concepts that jumped out at everyone.

Dr. Bell agreed with Dr. Tippeconnic and also wondered what would be in the introduction versus what would be in the body of the report. Dr. Demmert suggested a possible theme that would address (1) the relationship between the American Indians' right to govern and determine educational program and content, and (2) the ability to succeed.

Dr. Charleston said that in his view we are approaching a time in our history when we should go before Congress with a new treaty that could include a Bill of Rights. This would tie in well with the language of the early part of the introduction stating that we are in a critical battle for survival. A concept of a treaty could help Indians and non-Indians to work together in a joint commitment to end the long-standing conflicts between tribes and state and federal governments over the administration and funding of Indian education. We need a treaty that incorporates the following essential elements:

(1) Federal and state governments must come to understand the special trust relationship of our tribes with the federal government and the understanding of this special relationship needs to be understood and respected by state governments (because of the power of the states in dealing with present day Indian people). This relationship must be completely understood. The Department of Education does not understand the trust relationship or sovereignty--OIE is dealt with as one of many special interest groups. We need a clear legal understanding of the special government-to-government relationship of tribes and the federal government.

(2) There must be a clear understanding of governance and the need for Native governance of Indian education.

(3) Funding and resources must be assured. Without resources nothing will occur. Schools cannot be operated without adequate resources and facilities.

(4) We need personnel and programs that are acceptable and appropriate for our people. We need highly qualified professionals to run our programs.

(5) We need appropriate curriculum materials which are culturally relevant at all levels. This area needs to be recognized in some mechanism. It will require work and training programs so that we can rely on our communities and tribes to develop local materials.

(6) We need to develop a mechanism for ongoing research and evaluation to determine how well our efforts are working.

These needs are hierarchical in that one drives the other. They also imply a shared responsibility between the government and tribes. We should approach Congress with the concept that it is time to end this battle; it is time for a new treaty.

Dr. Bell suggested that it should definitely be an enforceable treaty. Dr. Charleston added that this would provide Congress with an opportunity to rectify some of the past wrongs. It could help resolve the guilt of non-Indians and the anger of Indians over the past. It could link the treaties of past generations with the commitments of the present generations of Indians and non-Indians.

Mr. Hill liked the concept of a treaty. He added that in drafting such a document we would need to pay attention to demographics as we talk about reservations. The 1990 Census data is not out yet, but I predict it will show that approximately 70% of Native American students are in public schools and in suburban/urban areas. The anchor for many may be the reservation, but this issues needs to be considered. I would like to see a draft of the Bill of Rights and Treaty in Albuquerque. Perhaps the final report should have a summary version and a longer version.

Mr. Ely offered two comments. (1) As a tribal leader, I would urge us to be careful in using the word "treaty" and trying to negotiate for all tribes. We would also need to be ready to track this initiative through Congress at every step, or it will get torn to shreds and the final legislation won't look anything like our original proposal. (2) It may be true that the Nation At Risk "sparkled," and I say this with all due respect to Dr. Bell, but there really hasn't been any significant improvement in education as a result of that report. The content is critical because we want to improve Indian education, not dazzle people for fifteen minutes.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy seconded Mr. Hill's concern about demographics. If you look at the data recently published by Montana's Office of Public Instruction, you find that Indians are 6% of the state's population but 11% of students in kindergarten through third grade. The youthfulness of our population needs to be constantly emphasized as well as its vitality to counter the popular myth cited by Dick West (Curator of the new Smithsonian Museum of the American Indian) that Indians are all in museums, dying, and disappearing. There is a vibrancy in Indian communities, especially in the growth of our children, and we need to emphasize the urgency--that our children need to be well educated. People with education are contributors to their communities and to society as a whole. We should remember that some of the Nation At Risk sparkle had to do with its focus on workforce preparedness. We don't want to be takers, we want to be effective contributors. At this point we do not have the educational tools to be contributors. As Dick West said, so many people have the idea that Indian people went away in the 1880's. Textbooks all over the country reflect this view. We need to address this. We are alive, well, and growing!

Mr. Lewis noted that changing conditions under which education operates suggest that we need to examine the way we do things and look for different approaches so we don't end up with more of the same. We need to look at other opportunities that exist with tribes and in urban settings to establish both schooling controls by parents and programs that reflect a view of Indian people as a success. We don't want to just take the American education system that has failed to serve us and rearrange it. We need to look at other approaches to meet the needs of our children and see how they might be developed. The hearings in Seattle and St. Paul were eye openers. When you look at Indian people in urban settings the situation is very different. Those Indian people are also strong and they are a part of our people as a whole. My focus has been on my system on the reservation, but we need to recognize the different needs of Indians in urban areas.

Mr. Hill pointed out that demographically Indian people were numbered at around 10 million in 1492 and in 1990 there are only about 2 million left. Most of these are under the age of 25 and this presents a dramatic picture of who is here. A soon-to-be-published IEL/AISES report on Indian demography entitled "1% of the population, 50% of the diversity" includes useful information in this area. (Task Force members are welcome to use the data in the draft; the full report will be released on November 9, 1990.)

Furthermore, we need a champion. We can utilize the role of Senator Inouye on the Hill. But if we want to do so, we should start building this momentum early. We need to be thinking at least ten steps ahead of ourselves.

Dr. Bell wondered about Ted Kennedy and whether or not he would be motivated to champion this cause. Mr. Hill thought perhaps Kennedy's motivation could be rekindled.

Dr. Charleston responded to the issue of diversity, saying that he hoped we could negotiate a unified tribal agreement to take before Congress. Of course there is diversity and there will be argument, as there should be, but we need to be able to see this as a positive process and negotiate an agreement among ourselves so that we can go to Congress as a unified force. He then agreed with Hayes Lewis on the issue of governance, saying that tribal government has for too long been a replica of federal government. We are doing the same thing in education and it is not working well even for the majority population. We need to have our own structure and system.

Mr. Ely asked if those who would be drafting the final report had enough feedback to move ahead. Dr. Demmert said yes, and that he would continue writing on the introduction and that Dave Beaulieu would continue writing on strategies to bring about change. Dr. Demmert then said that the meeting was at a point where we could move into a discussion of the outline and content. He asked that Dr. Charleston lead the Task Force quickly through the outline giving members an opportunity to respond, but first called a ten-minute break.

Morning Session - Continued

Dr. Demmert reopened the session at 12:10 pm.

Dr. Charleston said he would like to facilitate the discussion process by following through the agenda. He called attention to the bottom of page four of the San Diego Task Force Agenda, which listed the Overarching Issues, suggesting that because this was a close approximation of the issues, they use it as a structure to guide a discussion of the outline.

Dr. Demmert said that Task Force members may have different thoughts on the wording and should feel free to make comments as they reviewed the issues one at a time. Dr. Charleston said it might be helpful for the Task Force to discuss the issues while he remained quiet; however, Dr. Demmert preferred that Dr. Charleston walk the Task Force through the overarching issues so they could make comments.

Responsibilities and Roles of Governments, Tribes, and Native Peoples

Dr. Charleston began by noting that the issues of trust responsibility and sovereignty are ideas that Indian country and the U.S. Congress and Courts have dealt with for a long time. The executive branch of government needs to recognize us as aboriginal and sovereign tribes and needs to promote our self-determination. Sovereignty is accepted by the federal government in some areas, but needs to be extended to encompass administration of education.

The federal trust responsibility over education has been recognized by Congress as it requires the executive branch of the federal government to support Indian education. We need to establish a mechanism for government-to-government relations that includes tribal-to-federal governments and tribal-to-state governments.

We must consider accountability. Currently tribes are accountable to the federal government for the expenditure of government funds. We need to extend this concept so that school systems are accountable to the tribes, parents, and communities they serve. Accountability needs to be a broad concept and include responsibility to our people.

In terms of parent involvement and control, Indian people base their own governance on community control. However, Indian people currently don't have parent and community control in state or federal education systems; they only have advisory committees that advise in the operation of special soft-money programs for Indians such as the federally funded Johnson O'Malley programs and Title V programs. Non-Indian parents and communities exercise considerable control through electing schools board members and state school officials. Native parents and communities have little or no voice in these same systems. This issue needs to be discussed by the Task Force, and we need to make recommendations for accomplishing this.

Dr. Demmert commented that along with parents, we need to include the community. As we talk about tribes, we need to remember what it means in different communities, in different tribes, and in traditional and contemporary terms.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy expressed her concern that the Task Force was addressing only reservation people when discussing government-to-government relations. I am concerned about how urban Indians are brought into this issue. There are some children who are multitribal but are not officially enrolled in any tribe, and I am worried about this because I know very little about the urban situation; I feel comfortable in my own situation only because I am nestled in my tribe. However, recently I visited Lincoln, Nebraska, and saw there was a whole different world. There were seven or eight different tribes represented, creating a creature I never knew existed. I feel that there is not enough representation in the framework of the urban situation.

Dr. Ginsburg noted that this was an issue for David Beaulieu, who was not present. He also said that there was nothing to bring kids together who are spread out over urban areas. Some kind of mechanism such as magnet schools or services integration might be used to bring people together on common ground but this issue belongs in governance. Dr. Demmert noted that the authors should use David Beaulieu as a resource on this topic.

Dr. Ginsburg said that accountability is critical. We need to think more clearly about what we mean by this, and with what mechanism the Task Force wants to implement this, such as parent sign-offs. The Task Force needs to define the necessary action that will allow real control.

Mr. Ely had two comments to make: (1) He agreed with Ms. Pease-Windy Boy's comment that the report needs to address both urban and on-reservation students. Certain sections of the report cannot be generalized, just as the uniqueness of different tribes cannot be generalized. (2) He questioned whether the Task Force needed to follow this format and if all of these issues would be discussed in the report because it appears to be very long.

Dr. Demmert responded that the format was open to discussion.

Mr. Lewis suggested a section recognizing partnerships and coalitions. We are focusing on federal-to-tribal relations, but in some states other kinds of governmental relations are being discussed such as joint powers agreements between a coalition of concerned agencies and organizations. For example, in St. Paul people are concerned about the need to look at urban Indian education and to reach different factions. How do you look at options such as the Center School, Heart of the Earth, and South High School when students cycle through all of these? What mechanism can be developed--other than tribal, state, or LEA--to focus on the needs of the children? We need to look at the partnerships and coalitions that we have and are developing to include other options. Confining ourselves to the normal view is too restrictive.

Dr. Charleston said that there can be problems with different structures merging, because the concepts of sovereignty and governance tend to be merged and this doesn't work. Sovereignty and governance are two distinct topics. With respect to the concept of sovereignty, as an individual, I do not have a personal special relationship with the federal government. However, my tribe has a constitutional relationship via treaties and a tremendous volume of Indian law. As a member of the Choctaw Nation I am involved in that special relationship, but if I leave or am kicked out of the Choctaw Nation, I lose the benefits of that special relationship between my tribe and the federal government. This is a major issue for both state recognized tribes and people who don't have benefits from that special relationship. We do have urban Indian centers as a governance mechanism established to deal with Native people in urban areas, but we rarely have tribal sovereignty mechanisms in place for urban Native people. First, we need to recognize sovereignty of tribes over the education of their members in urban areas and establish a level of benefits for urban Native people based on the special relationships with the government. Urban Natives are indeed members of tribes. Second, we need to recognize a variety of governance structures that are appropriate for Indian people. Urban governance structures are likely to vary from reservation governance structures.

Dr. Demmert said they were ready to move on to the next topic but they first need to decide to what degree they want to address this issue. It will be controversial in some degree because of the different statuses and their need to provide a general overview to meet all of the needs. Mr. Hill suggested that we have the tribal leaders speak to this issue in Albuquerque.

Dr. Demmert said that he did not want the report to become too political. The question is whether the Task Force should focus on the kinds of activities that will improve academic performance or expand the report to include other things. Dr. Demmert felt this needed to be part of their discussion. Mr. Ely responded that for political and practical purposes they should limit the report to those things that directly impact education. Sovereignty is a valid issue but may be more appropriate in a different forum. There are so many aspects to confront, if we open up the subject we will have a free-for-all. This is a big issue with many other dimensions. Perhaps we can mention it in a paragraph without going into depth and focus the report on areas that impact education.

Dr. Demmert said he would like to continue this discussion because of its importance. For different groups in Alaska the issue of sovereignty was so controversial they couldn't even come to an agreement. The issue may get so large the Task Force will not be able to deal with it. However, he felt it was possible to address general perceptions without opening up all of the issues. Mr. Lewis agreed with Mr. Ely saying it would be very emotional and powerful in terms of content. Consequently, the emotion may detract from the purpose of the report because tribal emotions are attached to that sense of identity. Furthermore, we could be talking about this issue for the rest of the year. Mr. Lewis suggested recognizing the issue, but not dwelling on it for fear that it would explode.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy indicated that because we are dealing with public education, we have an obligation to address the issues of funding and local control. It is related to governance, determining who makes decisions about the classroom, teachers, and the curriculum. All of these issues are related to self-determination, but this Task Force is not able to decide about sovereignty. Funding is the building block of local control of education.

Dr. Ginsburg mentioned that other programs require sign-offs by parent committees, but our programs require only consultations. He asked the Task Force members if they could think of alternative mechanisms, especially for urban areas, to ensure direct input and approval for programs by parents. Dr. Demmert acknowledged that the Task Force needs to think about this. He also agreed with Ms. Pease-Windy Boy that they may need to focus on parental and local control.

Dr. Charleston suggested that we compare the structure and governance of Indian to non-Indian programs. There is an inequity when the majority has governance and the Indian communities have parent committees. We need equity and balance in those committees.

Dr. Bell said that if we can legislate rights of Indian children, any violation of these rights would go into federal court, as in the case of special education students. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy agreed that if we predicate the report on a Bill of Rights, we will gain quite a bit of clout. Consequently, local control will begin to take form because one begets the other. Dr. Ginsburg mentioned that the National School Board Association would probably oppose this.

Mr. Ely suggested that it would be a good idea to break for at least ten minutes so members could eat their lunches. Others agreed and a short break was called by Dr. Demmert at 12:40 pm.

Afternoon Session

Dr. Demmert called the meeting back to order at 1:00 pm.

Dr. Charleston recommended that the Task Force follow the outline and discuss the issue of resources next.

Resources

Dr. Demmert suggested that the Task Force may want their discussion on resources to include public, BIA, and contract schools and community colleges. They may also want to consider a wide range of funding sources including Title IV and other legislatively authorized programs. Dr. Charleston mentioned that Impact Aid was a big concern in Indian country because the laws requiring parental involvement and reporting were not being followed or enforced.

Dr. Demmert said the accountability issue should be added. He suggested the possibility of waiving regulations for communities that develop comprehensive plans for meeting the needs of Indian students. This could be a carrot for superintendents who receive different monies. Rules and regulations could be waived for administrations that put together a comprehensive plan. Dr. Ginsburg added that the comprehensive plan would include all of the resources.

Mr. Hill thought we needed to set aside money for Indian programs because it would not be done via the good will of local administrations. Mr. Hill recommended that we propose an office similar to FIPSE for Indian education. Furthermore, funding for the improvement of Indian education will increase resources necessary to leverage institutional change. We need appropriations to make this happen. Dr. Demmert said this is a possibility for recommendations to be discussed later on.

Dr. Tippeconnic had two concerns related to funding: (1) There is the question of what drives funding and what should be taken into consideration. Our programs are driven by state per-pupil expenditures; however, this determination has an impact on local districts and that is not always equal. (2) The larger issue is one of school finances at the state level and how we relate to that.

Dr. Bell asked Dr. Tippeconnic if he was saying the larger the state appropriations, the more money schools received for Title IV. Dr. Tippeconnic said yes, there was no equalization. Dr. Ginsburg commented that sometimes there were higher costs. Dr. Tippeconnic responded that it is an issue of excess costs for Indian students in public and non-public schools. These costs need to be considered so that more money is going to students. Dr. Tippeconnic thought this should be clearly articulated.

Dr. Ginsburg felt that we needed more guidance on this issue. A lot of money goes to the BIA with their level of funding at $10,000 per pupil. The question is how much actually goes to the local level. During debates at the federal level, these figures always come up. Dr. Demmert replied that two pieces were being worked on: The Senate Select Committee has a new document on funding for Indian education. Also the BIA Inter-Appropriations Committee (?), with representation from the House and Senate, are looking at the funding formula of the Bureau of Indian Affairs education to see what is happening and if we need to do more.

Dr. Bell questioned whether the $10,000 included residential schools. Dr. Ginsburg replied that it did not.

Mr. Ely said that we need to look at accountability of resources because we need to target more than just the federal government for funding. The federal government, states, tribes, and business communities are all responsible for providing resources for the education of our children. As Byron Fullerton said, we need to show that for a particular investment, we get a particular gain. If a community puts together a plan to benefit their community, they should have a shared commitment for providing some of the resources. Furthermore, the more we foot the bill at a local level, the more likely we are to get help from the federal government.

Dr. Charleston explained that the $10,000 figure came from a report which Ed Parisian told us was rejected by the BIA as being inaccurate. It seems the problem is the entire budget for the BIA was used in the calculations in the report including the administrative costs of the central office, 12 area offices, and some 83 local agencies. Ed told us that when you pull out the cost of running the bureaucracy, the amount that goes to schools is only $2,800 per pupil, a figure that is never quoted. We are supporting this tremendous bureaucracy and blaming the schools for excessive costs; however, the excessive costs are a result of the federal bureaucracy, not mismanagement of funds by the schools. Ed Parisian can provide more detailed information on this. Dr. Demmert mentioned that we could include this under the section on resources. Dr. Bell added that the national average was $4,000 per pupil. Mr. Hill said that we were blaming the victims again as we are supporting the weight of the bureaucracy. If we could give each student $10,000 per capita they could attend the best private schools in the country.

Mr. Lewis said he would like to look at the set-aside idea: When you look at the legislation and regulations of supplemental funding, whether it is federal Indian education funding or Chapter 1, there are so many focuses mandated by the regulations. Schools cannot use the funding beyond the guidelines even though it may be best for students to use the money in a variety of ways. A waiver plan would allow schools flexibility in using funds. This would provide a better opportunity to impact teacher-to-student ratios and the educational program. Set-asides can be used for strengthening programs for Indian people. Federal responsibility outside of categorical funds is lacking, and we have problems obtaining other support.

There is little communication between schools, Indian populations, and Bureau agencies. We do not know how JOM money is spent. They cannot say they put JOM funds into an equalization plan because that is not equitable. We are arguing with the State Department of Education on their definition of "supplement not supplant." The state funds a half day of early childhood education, and our community used JOM to fund the other half day. The state called this supplanting, but we call it supplementing. If the state only provides one-half of the necessary funding, they cannot complain about where we get the other half from. We get into meaningless arguments about what this phrase means. The concern about supplementing not supplanting served a function in the past, but conditions have changed and we should be allowed to change practices.

Dr. Ginsburg inquired if in developing a waiver we should include a statement for state funds as well. Mr. Lewis replied that yes, that would be helpful.

Mr. Sidney said that throughout the hearings we heard about the management of funds. I am interested in the BIA reorganization and how it will change what we write. We are planning to write what we've heard and I would like the most realistic report possible. Dr. Demmert predicted that the BIA reorganization proposal will take at least five years to be realized so both the Task Force and the White House Conference will have an opportunity to address this. Dr. Charleston mentioned that there was some testimony on the reorganization proposal indicating that closing the area offices would reduce education support services that are not provided in schools.

Mr. Martin said he would like to see the Senate report because it includes figures for Haskell on full-time employees. They consider Haskell to be a boarding school. This gets at the issue of the lack of support from the BIA and their manipulation and distortion of statistics. In budget meetings, people from the Department thought the Bureau should not even be in education. In terms of equity and funding, within the Bureau they believe that giving additional funding to one program means taking funds from someone else. Equity does not mean bringing others down to our level. Dr. Demmert said the meaning of the term equity needs to be stated throughout the report.

Dr. Bell asked Bob Martin if by ignoring residential services, costs at Haskell would compare with Kansas State University. Mr. Martin responded that funding would be significantly lower. We have $4,000 that includes full-time employees and dorms. When Dr. Bell wondered if the faculty salaries were competitive, Mr. Martin replied that either salaries are less, or we reduce the number of faculty members.

Dr. Ginsburg proposed that if they could give an example where a little money has done a lot of good, such as FIPSE, it would help the report. Examples take ideas out of the theoretical realm and make them real.

Dr. Demmert provided the following examples of programs to use as effective models in the report:

> St. Regis in New York. This program, operating for 19 or 20 years, has made continuous progress decreasing the dropout rate from 50 percent to 6 percent.
>
> Santa Fe Indian School, New Mexico.
>
> Mt. Edgecumbe in Sitka, Alaska
>
> Hayes Lewis' Zuni School. This school focused on the suicide rate, decreasing the rate to zero in three years.

Other suggestions were made for urban centers such as the Buffalo Magnet School, Seattle, and the Denver Indian Center.

Dr. Reyhner, commissioned author, said that when he went into public schools he heard stories about abuse of Chapter 1 funds. The red tape was initiated to prevent these types of abuses. He is concerned that if there is no control, funds may be abused again. Dr. Demmert agreed that we need to look at an improved plan.

Dr. Charleston introduced the next topic:

Education Personnel

Dr. Ginsburg noted that the topic of alternative certification had come up often. We need to define this not as throwing people into the classroom, but providing support and training. Dr. Demmert remarked that most of the testimony on alternative certification focused on language and culture experts from the community. He felt we needed to look at different options. Mr. Ely added that he heard of alternative certification for language and culture and also for vocational education. He also had heard people say they wanted education to maintain the standards of other academic professions.

Mr. Lewis said that community people in various areas have expressed a need for cultural awareness and orientation programs for all personnel to improve sensitivity. He believed that if we want to improve Indian education, it is important to include this as a key component in our recommendations since a majority of the adults teaching Indian children are non-Native. Mr. Ely heard testimony one step beyond this suggesting we actually test teachers to ensure they understand the culture of the community. We need to do more than recommend cultural awareness, we need to measure if it actually exists. Mr. Lewis suggested that we can lay out a structure vis-a-vis expectations and community norms. Teachers need real recommendations of how to internalize the culture into classroom practice.

Dr. Demmert mentioned two organizations that have requirements for multicultural programs. These organizations compel all of their members to include a multicultural component. The issue then becomes the quality of the classes offered to meet those requirements. Dr. Demmert mentioned that another focus of much of the testimony was on the need for teachers and administrators to be of and from the community served, and also the need to ensure teachers from outside of the community be culturally knowledgeable.

Mr. Ely said that we need to consider the difference between on and off reservation schools. For example, how realistic are these recommendations in a class in which only two out of 40 students are Indian? How much do these teachers need to be culturally aware? Dr. Demmert responded that we can talk about the need for Native American teachers and administrators, but it is important for all teachers to be sensitive to the cultures they serve.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that we also need a knowledge base from which the teacher training can occur, and this will be based on the number of Indian faculty. The question is how can we reinforce a system whereby Native faculty are better utilized. At ASU they had a list of 100 faculty members around the country who were struggling within that system. The other option is to go to community colleges.

Dr. Demmert said we need to look at the relationship between Native American faculty and the success of the students in those institutions, as is true for all minority groups. The College Board has evidence on these comparisons.

Mr. Lewis had two items to address on this issue: (1) Cultural orientation and awareness are important as well as practical experience. However, there were cases in Alaska and in St. Paul where the union had discouraged alternative certification and increasing the number of Indian teachers. This resulted in a struggle to get the union to accept the Indian community's view. This could become a bargaining issue. (2) In terms of teacher training generally, teachers intending to teach in Native areas need extra help at the college level. There needs to be an emphasis on different learning styles so the teachers are able to utilize the learning styles of Indian children. There are better ways to teach than those currently being taught.

Dr. Demmert noted that it was important not to stereotype learning styles of Indians. Indians, like others, have a variety of learning styles and strategies, as do teachers. Teachers need to take advantage of learning styles and challenge other styles. Our training institutions must ensure that teachers not only acknowledge different styles, but have the tools to teach to them.

Mr. Sidney added that in addition to training teachers, we need to look at training parents because schools need a working relationship with parents in order to affect education.

Mr. Hill referred to the Alaska meeting where they talked about "using the culture to teach" in addition to "teaching the culture." This requires more than one inservice training workshop; rather, it requires an ongoing process. Mr. Hill also expressed the need to ensure quality educators who are sensitive to the language and culture of the tribe, regardless of the race of the teacher. Just because a teacher may be Indian, he or she may not be qualified. We need a balance, but we also want good quality teachers.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested extending the idea to include parent training so parents could help their own children. He then raised the question of needing a performance evaluation or some other mechanism to get rid of bad teachers. Mr. Hill acknowledged that this was a tough question. He was not sure if testing was the answer, but agreed that there should be some criteria. However, in Indian communities there is a political price to pay for getting rid of teachers. There is also a problem with retention. For example, in remote areas in Alaska there is a high turnover among teachers, and no one in the schools knows the parents or grandparents. There is no stability of teachers. On the other hand, in Chicago people are in the schools for a long time and they know the community. We need more data on teacher retention.

Mr. Lewis said that the data are available through state education agencies. In his schools they have a very low turnover rate, with an average teacher stay of nine years. In finding teachers, we need better screening mechanisms and support systems. They had a resignation at the beginning of the year and had to look at many applicants before they filled the positions. It is important to find the right combination of education, experience, and familiarity with the community. The school then needs to design individual support plans, based on school expectations, to monitor and evaluate teachers in a supportive, humane way. These strategies help build longevity and stability. Furthermore, they provide due process, document concerns, and come right to the point. This way, people know they are not being "railroaded," they have rights and responsibilities. In the past ten years they have asked for 20 resignations but have had no litigation because they treat people fairly. They provide exit interviews for all people who leave because the school owes it to them to indicate areas for them to improve.

Dr. Ginsburg asked Mr. Lewis if he could write a few pages on these procedures to use as a model. Mr. Lewis explained that in New Mexico they do not have tenure, but instead have an arbitration process used especially for people who have been teaching for more than 10 years. Both sides have liabilities, but there are ways to structure the process so both sides gain. The school gains from having the teachers leave and hopefully the teachers learn from the situation and the exit interview.

Mr. Sidney suggested having inservice for school boards because they have the responsibility for eliminating ineffective staff. For example, in a child abuse case the school board could have removed the offender immediately.

Dr. Ginsburg said these concerns should not be limited to only BIA schools but should also include public schools.

Mr. Ely voiced his support for Mr. Hill's statement on teachers not being just an issue of race, but an issue of having good, qualified teachers. Mr. Ely then suggested a national retirement program. Some states have good teachers who would like to work on reservations but in doing so would lose their retirement. Consequently, they lose good teachers who are unwilling to change districts because they will lose their security net. Good teachers should be able to move to new districts without losing their retirement.

Mr. Martin brought up a point from the hearings and the BIA summits indicating the need for coordinated endeavors to develop research and multicultural recruitment efforts. He suggested that an American Indian teacher corps could be developed. This would require national coordination and could possibly be supported by the BIA.

Dr. Tippeconnic agreed with Mr. Ely that a good teacher was a good teacher. However, he felt there was potential for Indian teachers to be better for Indian students not by virtue of their being Indian, but because of their shared perspective. He felt that we need to look down the road and support teaching as a viable profession for our youth. We need more people channeled into other professions, but we also need more teachers. Dr. Bell commented that the school is our own best enemy because it has no career ladder or promotion system to serve as incentives. All schools have are salary schedules; they don't provide any opportunity for promotion. Higher education has learned how to keep their best personnel but we have not built up the public school teaching profession as we have higher education.

At 2:00 pm Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Afternoon Session - Continued

Dr. Charleston thought he had enough information on Data, Evaluation, and Research and suggested they talk about the next section.

Issues Specific to Stages of Schooling

These issues include (1) early childhood education, (2) quality schooling including enriching and challenging academic programs, infusion of Native culture and languages into the entire curriculum, and involvement of parents and community, and (3) postsecondary education.

Dr. Demmert mentioned that Ms. Pease-Windy Boy had suggested they talk about the tribal community college movement because this was an area that needed special emphasis. He suggested they first talk about that issue and then pull in other postsecondary needs. Dr. Charleston said this was important because many tribal colleges look at potential downward growth paths. For example, we could look at the development of middle colleges as alternatives for high school dropouts--instead of public high school. Colleges see the need to teach their own, even through alternative high schools. Subsequently they move students into the community college and later back into four-year institutions.

Dr. Demmert had two other suggestions to make: (1) The issue of prenatal care needs to be added to the section on preparing children for school. (2) The issue of language development and the development of a language base needs to go under the section on quality schooling.

Mr. Ely recommended that they add daycare curriculum and the support of Head Start under the section on preparing children for school.

Mr. Hill suggested the creation of an Indian Desk to compile data on Indian students because this job cannot be done only part time. Dr. Bell thought this should be located in NCES.

Mr. Hill also thought we needed a paper on science and math education to meet the needs of our technical society. Dr. Charleston indicated that such a paper has been planned but has not been funded. Dr. Bell commented that instructional technology was getting smart software that Indian students needed in order to join the 1990s. If we compare schools to banks or even grocery stores, we are not "with it."

Mr. Hill said he would proceed with the paper on science and math but he was not sure if we should talk about a national curriculum. Kids today need four native languages including math/technology, European, English, and their own Native language. I do not know if I can agree with a model curriculum, but I do know what the students need to go on to college: they need more than a textbook knowledge of math. I also suggest we build in a section on service learning. Dr. Demmert agreed.

Mr. Hill recommended they add educational system reform to the section on quality schools.

Dr. Bell suggested they include the newly adopted goals of the governors. Dr. Ginsburg explained that he cross-referenced the Task Force goals based on the national goals.

Mr. Ely had several comments to make regarding culture and the curriculum: (1) When we look into curriculum we need to regard language and culture as important to the identity of the individual and the tribe. On the reservation, language and culture can serve as a teaching tool to be integrated into the curriculum. Off the reservation, we need to consider differences in the population. (2) Curriculum on the reservations should prepare students for Anglo-American survival as well as community-based culture. (3) When we talk of culture we are referring to two things: traditional and dynamic culture. We heard a lot of testimony on both of these. Adults want kids to understand their tradition, but also know what is happening right now.

Dr. Bell asked if Mr. Ely would require students to study the history of their tribe. Mr. Ely responded yes, that education must have a purpose to provide incentives for the students to obtain an education. Such incentives might include getting a job, improving the economy of the community or reservation, perpetuating the culture, or learning problem solving skills. Mr. Ely felt we needed to reevaluate the curriculum so it is applicable and relevant to the students, the job market, and the culture. This is especially true where many kids are not going on to college and are staying in the communities. In Mr. Ely's community, many of the students go on to work in the fisheries. He believes many would stay in school if the curriculum was relevant. He also felt there needed to be some linkage between the business community and the schools for those who go to school in preparation for a job. Dr. Ginsburg noted that research shows effective vocational programs are linked to the business community.

Dr. Demmert commented that they need to discuss the purpose of education in the introduction of the report.

Dr. Ginsburg said that for accountability, they can look at dropout rates, attendance rates, and chosen courses. If we have this information, something can be done. If kids are disproportionately in special education, someone should look at this. If kids are not in advanced courses, again, someone needs to look at this. Dr. Ginsburg questioned how the Task Force felt about accountability.

Mr. Ely mentioned that we heard in the testimony that measures of success need to be defined by the community. Measures of success include a of items such as the ability to pass a test, graduate, go on to higher education, get a job, or participate in cultural survival skills. We need to have a measure of success; this has to be defined. When I ask people if they are successful, they respond that they are not in terms of testing, but they are in terms of life. So these terms need to be defined.

Dr. Ginsburg asked Mr. Ely if the measures of success should be locally determined, and was answered in the affirmative. Dr. Demmert said they needed some measure of success that could be discussed on a national level. Mr. Ely agreed, acknowledging they had to deliver a product.

Dr. Bell said he heard a great deal about competency exams, maybe because of the cultural bias. Indian students have not learned the white man's testing methods (especially how they cheat!) Something needs to be done about test bias because it is so unfair. Dr. Bell did not know what to do, but recognized it as an issue that came up a lot.

Mr. Lewis said we have to be sensitive in how we apply the tests because of what they measure. On the New Mexico competency test, many Indian children in the tenth grade fail. Forty percent of the tenth grade Indian students fail the test not because of intelligence, but because they are less experienced. By the twelfth grade, 90 percent pass. Dr. Bell noted that these statistics were a result of test taking skills. Many children from economically advantaged families learn these skills from tutors; however, Indian children do not have this opportunity.

Mr. Lewis commented that as services change, we cannot keep using the same measurements to test students. He suggested maybe we could use a group assessment to determine the level of the children, or measure performance of mastery. In order to foster coordination and a collective look into the classroom, we need flexibility to look at other standardized assessments. The CTBS used in New Mexico in grades three through five and the Stanford Achievement Test used in grades seven and eight reveal a cultural bias. What are these tests assessing? Children have to pass someone's test, but we need flexibility to choose or create our own tests. We have to look beyond the current boundaries.

Dr. Bell commented that he was on the board at ETS in Princeton. Currently they are looking at developing a new SAT and a new NTE. We should be studying the effects of tests on Indians and their cultural biases similarly to the way women pushed on this issue when they saw there was a bias against women. Although the SAT is designed to predict a person's college abilities, as a whole women performed worse on the test, but did better in college. Similarly, we need to see the effect of the test on Indians.

Dr. Ginsburg asked the Task Force members if they knew of any experts on the issue. Mr. Lewis suggested Joe Coburn at Northwest Regional Lab. Mr. Martin suggested Dean Arrowsmith. Dr. Demmert noted that we may need a team and suggested Margo Linton at ASU and Joe Trimbel at Western Washington, Bellingham, OR. Dr. Ginsburg asserted that this was a high priority and there might need to be a trade-off with other papers. Mr. Lewis commented that his experience with the NTE revealed it did more to measure endurance than ability. Dr. Demmert said they need to make a strong statement about testing in the final report because measurement of success is a strong term.

Mr. Hill told a story about his daughter who went to summer school. Students who had received a 'B' in high school calculus had a false sense of their abilities because they did not even know logarithms! A coach who got a 'D' in trigonometry was now teaching calculus. Students are bright enough, they just did not receive quality instruction. When students in the top of their classes go to college, they realize they were short-changed.

Dr. Demmert noted that students who take tests realize that if they were previously introduced to the material, they do well; if they have never seen the material before, they don't do well.

Dr. Charleston related this discussion to teacher competency and testing teachers to ensure they understand the materials. He thought we needed a way to measure current competencies.

Mr. Ely referred to the topic of parenting as mentioned in the section on quality schooling. He noted that parenting is very important, but surrogate parenting is also vital, necessary, and effective.

Dr. Charleston referred to the section for retrieval of dropouts and exceptional children, affirming the need for adult education and for alcohol/substance abuse programs.

Dr. Demmert asked the Task Force to think of things they had heard in the testimony that were not included in the outline.

Mr. Hill recommended that BIA and tribal grants be considered as sovereignty for awards that are removed from consideration in the needs assessment for postsecondary financial aid. He believes this is a tribal right and financial aid should exempt these awards. Dr. Demmert agreed. Dr. Charleston referred to testimony related to the procedure of including tribal property as an asset in determining the students' abilities to pay, regardless of the fact that this cannot be used as an asset. This formula is hampering students' abilities to go to school. Mr. Martin expressed his concern that financial aid is running out for students who switch programs or require an extra year to finish. Financial aid packages need to provide an allowance for this.

Dr. Demmert said that if we tie financial aid only to economic need, we will not increase the number of Indian students or professionals. Mr. Ely responded that there needs to be a limit or a cut off for those individuals who can pay. Five years ago they had a JOM program that received $25,000 and had only one staff member. The rest of the money went to buy tennis shoes. There were wealthy members on the committee making $75,000 per year who ensured that their own children got tennis shoes. This is unfair when there are needy children who require help. Mr. Ely believes that there needs to be an upper limit, and wealthy people shouldn't receive 100 percent of the benefits.

Dr. Demmert said he had a different position than Mr. Hill presented earlier concerning the number of Indian professors. Dr. Demmert believes that in order to increase the number of Indian professors, we need to find a way to support their education. We need programs that allow kids to go to school and complete their work.

Mr. Ely expressed his interest in graduating individuals who have a sense of personal responsibility to contribute to the society or community. It doesn't help an individual if we pay for his or her schooling when he or she is able to pay.

Dr. Charleston said that major research universities award graduate fellowships based on academic merit as a means to compete for and recruit the most qualified and talented graduate students. Many of the people to whom they give significant graduate fellowships are from relatively wealthy families. Because this is a merit award used to recruit the very best graduate students, the research universities make these awards to students even though they do not have a great financial need for the money. This is done purely on a merit basis. Dr. Charleston expressed his concern for many talented Indian graduate students who cannot afford to attend graduate school at expensive major research universities on the present fellowship stipends provided by BIA and ED. Even with a fellowship students need money to get there.

Mr. Hill said that it was a tribal right for people who are not able to make enough money to carry their share. People with decent values need to help build bridges out and back into the community. The educational bridge goes out, but there is no way for the kids to come back. We should take everybody and encourage their sense of responsibility for helping the next in line.

Mr. Hill also thought we should provide incentives for more tribally controlled community colleges. Twenty-six is not enough to serve the 300 recognized tribes. He felt we needed a larger base than we currently have. Dr. Bell questioned if all of the Indian colleges were two year institutions. Ms. King responded that two were four year institutions. Mr. Fullerton asked where the funding for community colleges comes from. Dr. Demmert explained that funding was provided by the federal government through the Indian Community College Act, and from the BIA, foundations, students, and the communities. Mr. Hill commented that nevertheless, the community colleges were grossly underfunded.

Dr. Tippeconnic indicated that the Office of Indian Education fellowship program funds 123 grantees based on academics and these grants are not usually reservation based. They do not have any tie backs and it is critical that mechanisms be developed to do that. We are presently not meeting the needs of tribes on reservations.

Dr. Demmert commented on professional development. Title IV brought this gap up when the legislation was being drafted; however, until we start placing Indian members in larger organizations, they will not be sensitive to our needs. We need to make sure we allow this and don't limit our scope to students returning to the tribes. The problem is that the funding level is not large enough to support enough students. Dr. Tippeconnic agreed that we need a balance, but currently we are over to one side.

Dr. Ginsburg said that in the early 1980s they eliminated needs testing in loan programs causing the grant program shift to middle income. Low-income kids were not getting enough and the students were going into debt. However, they have tried to put an end to that. If we move away from a need-based program it would be a different aid program. The Department will have to think hard about this.

Dr. Demmert expressed that one of the problems with the loan program is it is too scary. There are too many failures and the students have no future opportunity to come back. Repayment schedules don't work and parents can't help. This creates a major problem.

Mr. Martin mentioned there were several speakers on funding who addressed financial need, scholarships, and tribal need. The question is who determines the priority and how do we achieve a balance?

Mr. Sidney expressed his hope that the final report would include a tracking system so that in the next couple of years the people taking the place of the Task Force can see where we are, and schools that serve Indian children will know what is happening to them after they graduate.

Mr. Hill suggested that we exempt BIA and tribal scholarships and grants. We gave up 200 million acres of land and the treaty entitles us to education. He does however think we should stick with a need based program and we should not redefine financial aid. He also feels we need to leverage the success of kids and demand that the kids give back to their communities whether they are on or off the reservation. One student graduated from Penn State and went to work at Mobile for five years. He became a powerful role model and then returned to his community. We need to honor the successes of responsibility to the community, and honor the return to the community.

Dr. Charleston said it was suggested in a site visit that the BIA funded Indian Graduate Center in Albuquerque be duplicated around the country in regions for administering undergraduate scholarships and was interested in comments from the Task Force members on this topic. The proposal would entail moving the administration of federal undergraduate scholarship funds out of the BIA and tribes where they are currently administered to independent regional, Indian-controlled organizations that would administer the scholarships in an equitable manner under contract. These centers would be specifically for undergraduate scholarships. Mr. Ely responded that he didn't even want to mess with this. We worked long and hard to get this out of the BIA and we are more competitive than handing it out for votes. His tribe gets money and has a system for giving it out. He would like to leave this under current policy. Dr. Demmert commented that they need to think about college administration as complementary to BIA tribal administration. We can think of one being in addition to the other, but not in place of the other.

Mr. Ely thought funding of facilities should also go under the section on high schools, elementary, and contract schools. It is important to emphasize that facilities need to be brought up to standards. They should not only be safe, but also conducive to learning. Mr. Lewis agreed.

At 3:00 pm Dr. Demmert called for a ten minute break.

Afternoon Session - Continued

Dr. Charleston said the Task Force had finished discussing the topics originally planned, which will provide guidance for writing the report. He mentioned there was one hanging issue involving the commissioned papers. The original plan was for the authors to meet with the Task Force earlier in September, but because of problems with awarding the contracts through Grants and Contracts, that meeting was delayed. This trip is the first of two planned trips. The second meeting could occur either in Albuquerque or in Phoenix at the next Task Force meeting. The problem with meeting in Phoenix is the Task Force will be reviewing drafts of the Final Report and may not have the time for discussion of paper topics with the authors.

Mr. Martin questioned what would be happening in Albuquerque. Dr. Charleston explained that the Task Force had been asked to hold an additional hearing or meeting to allow tribal leaders and others from the Southwest to testify. Some people present at the Phoenix hearing were unable to speak. A meeting in Albuquerque would provide them a second opportunity to present information to the Task Force.

Mr. Ely asked the authors if they had enough information to have a draft of their papers complete in February. He would rather see drafts of the papers so he would not have to go to Albuquerque. Mr. Ely felt he could read from his office just as well as in Albuquerque. Ms. King commented that they were hoping to give drafts of the papers to Task Force members for comment. There is no need to drag the authors to Albuquerque as it is just as easy to send papers through the mail.

Mr. Brown, commissioned author, indicated that the authors will be able to draw a lot of information from the transcripts, but they still need other sources to tap.

Dr. Demmert said the Task Force needed time to respond to the papers.

Mr. Ely believed that if the Task Force was to review drafts, all members should go so they can discuss the issues. However, he was trying to get way from meeting in person. Mr. Fullerton suggested they could have a process whereby there is a limited time to respond to the papers.

Dr. Charleston explained that the commissioned paper process included a draft due in the middle of December, with final papers due January 14. The Task Force will have their papers one month before the meeting in Phoenix, and thus the authors may not need to be on the agenda and go to Phoenix.

Mr. Ely noted that the Task Force members would be receiving papers from the staff on an ongoing basis and thus wondered if the Task Force needed a meeting in Albuquerque. Mr. Hill responded that a hearing would be important for tribal leaders.

Mr. Hill then inquired about pending commissioned papers. Dr. Charleston responded that out of 21 papers total, nine have been granted. Dr. Ginsburg explained that there would be more papers soon but because we don't have a budget now, we will have to go back and see what resources there are. We also have the possibility of two more potential papers. I expect that there will be at least six more papers funded. Our goal is to get all of the papers out by mid November.

Mr. Hill said we need the papers before the report. Mr. Ely agreed. Dr. Charleston noted that it is unlikely that ED will be able to grant papers prior to mid November which will make a really tight schedule for getting them prior to the final report. We are already one month behind on the first round of papers because we missed the initial discussion meeting which is being combined now with NIEA.

Dr. Demmert reiterated Mr. Ely's proposal to not schedule a meeting in Albuquerque and hold only a hearing there. The Task Force could respond to individual papers by providing written comments through the mail. If we need a meeting at a later date will can schedule one at that time. Mr. Ely confirmed that this was his preferred plan.

Dr. Ginsburg questioned who would be at Albuquerque. Dr. Charleston said that the conference meetings in Albuquerque were to be held on November 12, 13, and 14, and suggested that Task Force meet on November 13. Dr. Ginsburg suggested that if enough Task Force members attended, they could discuss the report. Mr. Ely said this was okay as long as they did not make any final decisions.

Mr. Fullerton moved, and Mr. Martin seconded, that they hold a meeting in Albuquerque. There was no further discussion. Mr. Ely opposed the motion, all other Task Force members were in favor, and the motion was carried. Dr. Ginsburg reminded the Task Force that this was subject to funding. The Task Force decided to hold a meeting on Monday, November 12, and a hearing on Tuesday, November 13. The motion was passed unanimously.

At 3:25 pm Dr. Demmert adjourned the meeting.

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Fourth Business Meeting: February 12 - 14, 1991

Palo Alto, California

The fourth meeting of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force was held in the Bechtel International Center at Stanford University, Palo Alto, California. Task Force members present included Co-chairs Terrel Bell and William Demmert. Members present were David Beaulieu, Joseph Ely, Byron Fullerton, Hayes Lewis, Bob Martin, Janine Pease-Windy Boy, Ivan Sidney, Robert Swan, and Eddie Tullis. Staff members present included Executive Director Alan Ginsburg, Project Director Mike Charleston, and Deputy Director Gaye Leia King. Others in attendance included John Tippeconnic, Director, U.S. Office of Indian Education; Ann Medicine, Assistant Dean of Human Services, Stanford University; Donna Rhodes, President, National Indian Education Association; Robin Butterfield, Civil Rights Specialist, Oregon State Department of Education and Commissioned Paper Author.

Tuesday, February 12, 1991 - Morning Session

The meeting was called to order at 9:20 am by William Demmert. He began by asking that fellow Task Force members recognize Alan Ginsburg for his Executive Service Award.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Charleston to review the materials in the members' packets which the Task Force would be examining. Dr. Charleston identified these materials including minutes of the Task Force meetings in Juneau and San Diego with highlighted sections and Charleston's notes in the margin relating to the Task Force members comments and discussion that were used to develop the contents of the drafts of the final report. He called attention to the two versions of the draft final report prepared by the staff for review by the Task Force:

(1) The first version is the full third version of the draft report written by Dr. Charleston entitled "Toward True Native Education: A Treaty of 1992" containing a set of recommendations and draft bill of rights sections written by Dr. Demmert. This third draft combines all of the parts produced to date which had been sent to the Task Force members individually as the parts were being written. It also contains graphics.

(2) The second version is a draft final report entitled "A Time for Change." This version contains the latest version of the introduction written by Dr. Demmert followed by a section written by Mr. Lewis titled "The Nature of Native Education," and those portions of the "Treaty" relating to Native education and reform of public education but with softer language, and the recommendations and the 'Bill of Rights' written by Bill Demmert. The second version does **not** include the 'secret war,' 'ghost dance,' 'pseudo-quasi-true terminology,' 'national tribal alliance,' or 'treaty' sections found in the "Treaty of 1992."

Mr. Lewis explained that his piece was an historical perspective on what has led up to the current state of Indian education. It presents a sequence of comparable events to clarify the situation.

Dr. Charleston explained that the "Time for Change" is 57 pages long, within the expected 60 page limit but has no graphs. However, the page length of the "Treaty of 1992" version exceeds the planned length. It is 73 pages long because it includes all the other materials and graphs developed to date so the Task Force would have all materials presently available to work with during this meeting.

Also included in the packets are the original papers submitted by Dr. Demmert and Mr. Lewis and a paper by Alan Ginsburg titled "The Sense of the October 17th Meeting in San Diego" that is a discussion of the contents of the final report based on the San Diego meeting.

Dr. Charleston explained that:

> I have attempted, in the creation of the "Treaty" version, which was my first draft, to incorporate those things in our proceedings that I have indicated in my handwritten notes on the side and the approaches that are used in this 'Sense of the Meeting.' I have incorporated a great deal of the structure of both the papers from Bill Demmert and the submission of information by Hayes throughout the "Treaty" report and then in more or less their original form in the "Time for Change" version.

Dr. Demmert opened the meeting for discussion, saying that the Task Force needed to talk about different perspectives. He indicated that he had not finished looking at the "Time for Change" and would provide time before lunch for members to review the papers. He said:

> I had some concerns with the "Treaty" piece. I personally thought that it was a little strong. And so, I revised my introduction and expanded it just a bit. And I have that as an alternative to that section and would like to hand that out today.

Dr. Demmert provided the members a handout that was a revision of the introduction paper by Dr. Demmert titled "The American Native: Nations At Risk."

Dr. Demmert continued:

> For those of you who I have talked to, I didn't talk to all of you, I couldn't reach all of you, I did ask you, as you read those reports, to begin thinking very seriously of what the report ought to include and put together some ideas. I also asked you to be prepared to talk about the perspective from which this report ought to be; and, I would like to open the discussion for both of those pieces now, in any order.

Mr. Ely said:

> Rather reluctantly, I'll take a shot at it. I have read some of the material, I have to admit that I haven't read all of it. As the material comes in and I get three-quarters the way through new material comes in which preempts the last material. So trying to keep up hasn't been as easy as I thought it would be.

He felt that the introduction Dr. Demmert wrote could be used in the final report with some revisions, but he was very disappointed with the "Treaty of 1992."

Mr. Ely said:

> Most of all, I didn't see a resemblance to this report ["Treaty of 1992"] to a lot of the discussion that we had had prior to it. And, I saw no resemblance between it and the report that was sent out about a month and a half or two months prior [Demmert's original version of the Introduction in the "Time for Change"]. I thought that it was angry and offensive. And, I don't think that it can be used in any form. I think that it is so poor that it can't be marked up and changed to be acceptable. And I would suggest that it be completely thrown out and that we start again.

Mr. Sidney thought that the Task Force was looking to build on the successes in Indian education and would focus on the 'Bill of Rights.' He also expressed agreement with Mr. Ely on the "Treaty of 1992." We need to have a report that is to the point. "I felt that it was a little bit too hard myself."

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said:
I had a real sense of urgency once I read this report ["Treaty of 1992"]. In fact I have to say that it had the punch that I was hoping for. I think that it is easy to figure that you can preach to the congregation. And, I think, the way I was trying to look at it was, if I knew nothing about Indian education, how would this affect my newly developed concept of Indian education? Like you, I have traveled a lot through the United States and find a tremendous level of ignorance about us: 'Do Indians exist?' 'What is happening in their lives?' and so on. And, I also reflect back on the Nation At Risk report, which when you read it, the first thing you do is say 'My word, is this our situation?' And, the effect of it really needs to be jarring. Now, while what I am looking for may not go as far, perhaps, as the "Treaty," the "Treaty of 1992," I think that we have a must, a moment of opportunity. We need to be able to get the attention of people. Because the urgency is so terrific. I think that we tend to want to be nice, and nice is not what we are about. I think that we need to be honest and forthright about the urgency for education. I saw that urgency in that report. And, for that reason, I think that it is critical. It is not a report that speaks to me but tries to figure what is going to move things out there. And, I think that this is quite moving. We need to move! What is remarkable is the process that we have gone through here. I thought I had the first hand impressions that were as accurate as you know. I kind of had some faith and trust. But, I think that the accuracy of my impressions, the situation, is far more urgent than what my impressions were after twenty years of experience in the business. So, I think that we can understand by softening that we won't do justice to our endeavor.

Dr. Beaulieu said:
I agree that we need to be very forthright and hard-hitting. And I agree with Janine about the need to describe urgency, awkward issues requiring action and having certain kinds of urgency. I think it is very important how we define what we think is urgent. If we are not able to capture the last 20 years of Indian education and describe that honestly -- we have significant, unprecedented Indian involvement in defining the issues and being involved with the issues -- that is the real history in the last 20 years. Never before has that ever happened. We have incredible numbers of programs, we have 28 tribal colleges now, we have 80 schools, elementary and secondary programs operated by tribal governments and so forth. I think that if we can talk about that history honestly, that will be able to present such an urgent picture for change. And, that, in spite of all that, what are the issues now? We have to sort of describe that and get the sense of the pride and accomplishment of Indians for Indian education for the last 20 years. If we continue to hit upon the tragedy theme that was in the Kennedy Report -- this is not, this is not the time of 'national tragedy -- national challenge' anymore. We are not at that desperate point. We have people involved all over Indian education now who are able, more than ever, to accurately, honestly and forthrightly describe what the issues really are. I think that we have to capture that -- that 20 years of experience -- somehow. If we continue with the tragedy theme now, in spite of our involvement we have, I think that we sort of kick ourselves in the shin.

Mr. Lewis said:
There are a lot of important issues included in the report ["Treaty of 1992"] -- I haven't completely looked at draft 3 yet, but I have been working on the first one primarily. And, I know from the other ones that the sections did not change that much. There are some issues in there and some concerns that we have been talking about and that we have been hearing at the regional conferences, the hearings, that are real important to build on. However, I also agree that the tone is almost strident in some ways. I really believe that we need to promote and communicate this sense of urgency that is out there because you can see it every day in a variety of situations. Although it is true that a number of those situations have changed, and I'm just reflecting back on the New Mexico experience over the last four years where we are

seeing the development and relationship beginning to develop between tribal communities and the schools that serve them. I think that looking at it from an implementers point of view, a person who is right on the line, to take the information from the report, how do I translate that into action? I think that in the current stage that it is in, it is going to miss the point. It is really hard; although there is a lot of good information in here, nothing really grabs you and says, 'OK, here's a situation, these are some concrete recommendations that you can implement.' And, I think that it leaves it a little bit too general in some ways that people are going to have a hard time making that translation. And, if we are going to communicate a sense of urgency, also with some strong clear recommendations, there has to be that connection; otherwise, the people at the field level are going to interpret a lot of this information probably in a wrong way.

And, then, the other thing is, in terms of some of the more global concepts that are communicated in the report, I think that we should stay away from concepts like 'pseudo Native education,' 'true Native education' and things like that. We are having a hard enough time dealing with 'Indian education,' first of all, that we need to communicate that very strongly from the sense of the people that are living in that situation every day. I think that if we get too hung up on those kinds of concepts, people are going to be laboring through what does this mean. I think people here sitting at this table understand what those issues are and the concepts, but the people who are going to be on the line, most of them don't have a sense of Indian education, much less a sense of the history and the oppression that is being characterized in here.

And, to some degree, I think that it has to be more balanced. We need to say at one point that we have had this experience; these are conditions that are still prevailing; what are we going to do about them? Not get to the point of being either whinny or developing this picture of where we are the victims. We are not the victims! We have an opportunity to change the circumstances of education, the quality of education, and at the basic level. And, we have got to communicate that in a way that is positive and proactive and, also, in a dynamic way that people can get a hold of. Otherwise, in the present format, those policy-makers that we are trying to target are going to be turned-off. I'm not saying don't put any of that in there, I'm just saying let's describe it in a better way -- in a different way. Characterize our situation and how we are going to get out of this in a more proactive and positive way because there is, I think, a real danger of turning those people off. Because, whether we like it or not, we are not going to turn back the clock to the extent that we are going to clear the table and come up with a new treaty. I think that there are so many connections and those other agencies that we have developed relationships with are not going to go away. I think that if there is a way to change the situations that we control, then we need to do that.

Also, those agencies like the Bureau of Indian Affairs that serve Indian communities and peoples need to also be restructured. There wasn't that much of a discussion about that issue. I think that one of the things that we generally talk about are the concerns of Indian education in terms of the Bureau situation and a lot of people have come to the hearings talking about that and we say we are going to relay the information. However, we have not really talked about the overlying bureaucratic structure that a lot of the Bureau people live and work under every day. If anything needs to be restructured, it's that one. And, I think that we need to look at the Bureau issues as well as the public education issues in a broader context.

One of the tie-ins to the Indian experience in terms of the on-going struggle as characterized by the 'secret war' and 'the ghost dance;' I had an interesting interaction with one of the people I work with. He is a Zuni person, he is one of our key assistants in the school district. He is also one of our spiritual leaders. He is a Kiva leader and one of the ... priests. As I was reading that section on the ghost dance, I had it open there, he came in to talk about something. And, a thought was going through my head, and he just reinforced it. He looked at it; he said, 'Hey, a new ghost dance.' He said, 'What is that about?' So, we started talking about it. And, I said, 'Well, here take a look at it.' And, as he was reading it, his expression was changing and he said, 'Well, you know something,' he said, 'how will we translate this concept about the ghost dance to our people. Because we are not sitting there talking this language; we are talking another language; we are talking Zuni.' He is very educated and knowledgeable and he said, 'I know what the writer or what you are trying to communicate with the concept of the ghost dance and the revival and how that started.' 'But,' he said, 'for most of our Zuni people, they don't understand that. And, in the Zuni way,' he said, 'what we're looking at is the issue of trying to communicate to our people: We are going to somehow revive these spirits of people who have gone on. And, in our prayers we say to people when they pass on, we tell them, we admonish them, don't come back to us and bother us in any way.' He said, 'Are you saying that somehow, if you translate this, somehow you are going to bring this in?'

So, that was a whole new twist that I think he was correct in identifying. It's going to have to be translated to people in a variety of ways, not just necessarily English, but in the Crow language, in the Northern Cheyenne, in the Navajo language, the Zuni language, and you name it. And, a lot of these concepts, we are going to have to walk through. But, I think, the way we can do it is really keep true to the issue and the needs that characterize our situation and keep them clear and perhaps a little more simpler so that we discuss with them the reality of the situation that we are living in, the power that they have to be able to transform that reality in different ways, and what is the system going to do to assist that working in partnership with the tribal community.

And, that is what I think that we need to communicate is where are those handles that we are going to get a hold of policy-makers and implementers so that we make an objective change in that reality and get off this discussion of how we have been beat down and worked over and whatever through history and come away from some generalized understanding of what needs to be done to make some more specific kinds of descriptions of how we are going to improve the situation for our people. Those are some general observations and comments that I have at this time about the report. But, I think it does need to be characterized in a different way. I think it needs to have urgency, needs be hard-hitting and dynamic, but at the same time it needs to be a little bit more balanced.

Mr. Martin said:
I wanted to express my appreciation to Mike and his staff for all the work they have been doing. I think they have done a great job considering all of the material and the relatively short period of time that you all have had to go through the public hearings. And, I think you have given us a good starting point to bounce things off of and hope to come up with a report that is going to do what we have all wanted to accomplish. And, that is something that is going to bring about some action to improve the situation. And, I think that most of us, as we look through it, we realize that we need to emphasize brevity and we are looking for clarity. I would agree with Hayes that we need some balance in terms of the sense of urgency and clear recommendations and also a process of strategy -- how do we bring about that change. And, I noticed that it's to be addressed. In the drafts, you are starting to develop that part in the implementation strategy. In terms of the plan, I think that you are going to have to delineate that in steps of how we are going to bring about these changes, how these recommendations are going to be implemented. I think that if we can do that, I think that is what the people are going to be looking for. I think that most of them have a sense of urgency themselves and what recommendations are going to come forward. But, I think, what they are really seeking is how is this going to happen? How is this change really going to come about? So, I think, that the strategies and process are going to be the key.

Dr. Bell said:
As many of you know, I have spent much of my life in the political arena of education. A man in Wyoming once, when I was superintendent of schools there, told me that the only

thing worse than a politician is a school politician. He said, 'You're the slickest school politician in Wyoming.' It was a compliment I thought, but he didn't mean to pay me one. I say that before I make my comments. I think that this report needs to make its best effort it can make to move people to action. All people, not only the Native population but the powerbrokers in Washington and the state houses. If we do not do that, the time we have spent on this Task Force, I don't think will result in an improved education.

I proposed to President Reagan in early 1981, in a memo to him, that he appoint a national task force, a national commission on excellence in education, to study globally the condition of education in America and report to the American people. I felt it was so bad that we needed something that would rally the people to education. This triggered a lively debate over in the White House. Ed Meese thought it was one of the stupidest things that had come over there in some time. We needed to be lowering the federal governments role in education. Here I come along when we were suppose to abolish the whole department, Bill, and propose this.

Dr. Demmert: I knew it wouldn't happen when you were appointed.

Dr. Bell: So, after a lengthy debate, and I thought I would never hear from the Man. One Tuesday afternoon, after a cabinet meeting, he fingered me over, and I followed him into the Oval Office. In his kindly way, he said, 'I just can't approve your recommendation. I know you mean well, but, Ted, nobody reads government reports. They just draw dust on the shelf. They weigh about forty pounds and whose going to read them?' In effect he was saying why don't we devote our attention to something that will do some good.

I was quite stunned with that and went back to my office and thought about it, brooded about it for a couple of days. And, I thought we still need to do that. We need a grabber! -- to grab and shake people and get their attention. So, I went ahead and appointed my own. It wasn't as good as having a presidentially appointed commission. But, I appointed my own, as Secretary Cavazos did when he appointed this task force. And, we were lucky, lucky to get those who were willing to serve on the commission.

They were shrewd about what the report ought to say so that it would have an impact. And, you know the rest of the story. In April of 1983 when A Nation At Risk came out, we were on the front page of every newspaper. We were the subject matter of editorial comment. And, we were discussed in news comments on TV. From a relatively obscure cabinet position I was in demand to go "Meet the Press" and "Face the Nation" and all of that. Believe it or not, even Ronald Reagan, David, when we came up to Minnesota for our first dissemination conference, called and said, 'Can I have a part on the program? You can fly up with me on Air Force One.' [Referring to David Beaulieu and Minnesota]... We asked your governor... to be the keynote speaker and he told me he just couldn't work it into his calendar at that time and that he was sorry. Two days later, Ronald Reagan invited himself and word got around in the Minneapolis area that the President was coming. Rudy called and said, 'I've been looking at my calendar, and I think I can make it.' I'm telling you that about politicians and how they love limelight. You can criticize them for it. But, that's the way you get reelected. There is nothing like having a hero's cloak around yourself or on your great charger out doing things.

And, we don't know; I don't know that no matter what we do with this report, it'll have the impact that it ought to have. Out of 250 million people in the country, it affects, what, a million and a half. But, we ought to say these are the most precious people in this country.

We ought to, we hadn't ought to loose this part of it Mike, the 'give'm hell' part of it. I'm saying let's not take that out of this report. I'm just saying, let's not say it up front. Let's say it, I'm just expressing my views, as some closing shots. I agree that maybe the 'secret war,' the 'siege' and so own is a little too heavy for me. But, keep in mind that you are hearing those words out of a white man. I don't live where your ancestors have lived and endured what they have lived and what some of you have endured. So, I need to bear that in mind. And, I need to have compassion for that. But, I'd say I wouldn't close this report without saying shame on you, we are still not doing what we ought to do for this precious population.

So, if I were doing it -- Bill, I'm talking too long here, but, then I'll have had my say -- up front, I'd think in terms of the newspaper headline writer, I'd think in terms of the political impact, and as you open this up, the first words I read I'd want to be the kind of words a good journalist writes in a great story. So the first words in this report, if I can persuade you to do it, is where I would deliver those first impressions. I'd be looking for impact on the press. And, if they don't take note of this when it first comes out, they are not going to do it in two or three weeks. Like Ronald Reagan says, it'll draw dust on the shelf.

So, I would highlight the fact that this country is deeply concerned about the education of its people -- all of the people. And, almost 30% of them drop out and don't even graduate from high school. Fifty to sixty percent in the big cities quit school. That's our total population with all of the cultures and so on. And, we have had the decline in the college entrance exams and you know all of the rest of it. So, I would want to say, as bad as that is, look at our failure with respect to these Native students, these Native children. I'd highlight that. And, I'd have quick punchy sentences. Maybe its not the best model, it's the model I know, that's the Nations At Risk model, but those first few sentences and paragraphs present it... I would be thinking in terms of journalists in those first paragraphs. So, when they open it, that's what they read first.

And, I think next, we can be looking at some of the other things that ought to happen. We ought to be saying what must be done. And, we ought to highlight what it'll cost if we don't do it. We don't like it, a lot of us, but we are driven by economics and business and the profit motive. And I'd highlight how costly it is going to be if we don't meet these needs. And, there I would emphasize the Bill of Rights. I think the Bill of Rights we have in there is just fine. But, I don't think it goes into enough detail. I don't think that it ties and binds like it should. So that we can come back and quote it. So I would like to see more specificity there.

I would like to see in the report, maybe following that, highlights some of the great contributions down through the history, including today, of some of our foremost Native American citizens. Now that is where I would emphasize, Robert, the successes. And, that's where I would say look at the intelligent people with a lot of potential, and look at what these have done. And, I would speak anecdotally again. And, that will give a lot of sources of pride. And, if we don't get that in here, we will be remiss I think. So, I would highlight that. And maybe some of you know, I have to confess my ignorance, I don't know as much you about that, about the great leaders we have today, some of the well educated individuals. I've been proud of Bill Demmert. I know where he came from. A Ph.D. out of Harvard and all the rest from pretty humble circumstances. When you come up from that, it's really remarkable. You see a lot of other people that have done some great things but they ought to because of their circumstances. So, I would want to have that in there.

All this, and it sounds like, 'Hey Ted Bell, you're conflicting yourself. You have got to be sparing of words.' So, every sentence really needs to paint the picture in that regard.

And, then, I believe, maybe tied to that somewhere, I would try to connect the Native American culture with the fact that we are obsessed right now in America with the environment. And, with that, the preservation of our history. We try to tear down, in Boston or Philadelphia, a building that was there back in revolutionary times, and justifiably you'll catch hell for it. There is a national historical site preservation. What are we trying to do? We are trying to preserve our culture since we came here and got through -- I guess we never got through -- raping and pillaging your peoples, if I can talk as a white man to you in that regard. And, I'd say, I'd have the report say: look, we're trying to destroy this culture that was here long before the first house was built or the 13 colonies ever got started. And, I'd want to shame them a little bit there. In a good way, not too subtle, but not too nasty either, highlighting the fact that we are, consciously or unconsciously, whatever it is, it's the result. And, that's what you were saying to us Mike. We have been systematically destroying the language and the culture and the heritage. And, after it's gone, we'll never get it back. It's just like when we tear down some of these historic buildings in America, we know we are not going to get them back. So, by law, we are preserving them. Now, I think, that if we tied that in, we'd make a good case. And, what's more, I think that every youngster in America, whether he or she wants to or not, ought to be compelled to learn the basic culture, the original culture that was here in that regard. I'm not trying to say that to be patronizing, it is just the fact of what ought to be. And, I would try to make a case for that in that regard.

Then, I think, I'd try to get in, Mike, a good strong 'give'm hell section.' I wouldn't make it too bitter; but, I certainly wouldn't make it mince words and be too, what we use to say in Idaho, mealymouthed about it either. I'd put it right out. Have it in there to look at and refer to. And some of us giving speeches afterward, you can quote it. You can always flip back and quote things when you're on the podium and you're before people. And, if we do our job right, this will be a basic reference point for some time. We are still whipping out A Nation At Risk.

And then, I'd end it with a final plea. If you can do that in about 15-20,000 words -- you say, 'Hey Ted Bell you can't do it' and I can't; I'm a poor writer, but I know people that can -- where every sentence in every paragraph is crafted. So, that's what I'd like to see.

And, I think all of the elements of that are in the materials that I have read. And, I can just read a lot of heart and soul in what I have read. And, I join the others in commending Mike. And, at the same time, Mike, when I picked up that "Treaty of '92" my first draft, I went 'Oh! my damn, that's going to make all us Caucasians shut-off immediately. So, I wouldn't not say it (to use a double negative), I just wouldn't have it up front. But, I'd have a 'give'm hell' section in there. And, I think if we don't we are going to be losing in that regard.

That's my view of what we ought to try to do. Undoubtably, I have left some things out. But, most of all, this report needs to be a clarion call to action. And, for the newspaper people and the headline writer, if it is not up front, it will never be in Newsweek and Time and U.S. News and World Report and commented on by Dan Rather and Peter Jennings and the others. And, that's what I thought about, what I read about, as I read the drafts that have come out and looked at this and contemplated it as soberly as I know how.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said:
Might there be some virtue to looking at the abilities of a technical writer who could find those central elements in those materials that we have now, that can put it in the language that is straight forward that the journalist would look for. I'm concerned that academia doesn't train us to do those sort of things. I know one of the things that I had done pleased my professor but nobody else. Also, I'm concerned with metaphors. While those of us understand what the ghost dance is, and it is powerful in its model, the use of metaphors are lost on many people in the United States. They are not particularly well versed in our cultures and for many other reasons. It seems to me, if we considered that and the need for brevity, maybe we are looking at some technical assistance in building what we are trying to assemble here.

Mr. Ely said:
Are you looking for technical assistance or another writer?

Ms. Windy Boy:
I think another writer who is skilled in a journalist sense.

Dr. Bell:
I think that if you did that, you better have a couple of you with the feelings in your innards at the right and left elbow as this individual writes. Use that skilled technician and craftsman, that professional writer, and protect from dilution.

Mr. Ely said:
I think there are plenty of good writers out there who are also Indian and can maintain that same type of feeling and emotion. I think that would be important. The reason I'm saying this, is that what you have just told us, you have told us five times and we have said five times and it's not getting down on paper. And what we need to do now is say it's not getting put down on paper. Then, this individual cannot put it down on paper. So, let's get somebody who can, in fact, put what we have been saying over and over and over and Indian people have been saying over and over and over on paper. I think, pardon the expression, but, I think until we do that, we are just sitting here 'pissing in the wind.'

Dr. Beaulieu remarked that one challenge of the final report is that it needs to address two audiences. The report has to speak to the heart and soul of Indian people; otherwise, it will sit on the shelf regardless of any attention it receives from the press.

Dr. Bell agreed and said that at the same time it has to generate some headlines in some newspapers and some editorial comment. That will take some real doing, but I think it is doable.

Dr. Beaulieu, agreed and said:
At least one thing that makes me get a sense of concern and urgency is the fact I think we have the potential of embarrassing the heck out of the country with what we have attempted and tried so desperately to do on our on terms, and, to be unsustained. It is like maybe twenty years ago it was a barren field out there and now we have got grass and we have got everything starting to grow. And, all of that needs to be protected and sustained. And, those efforts are all threatened.

Dr. Swan said:
Well, I would like to go back to the first draft [of the "Treaty of 1992"]. When I got the first draft, and got through it, I was pretty upset over several parts of it. I believe Hayes brought out the problems with 'pseudo,' 'quasi,' and 'true' Native education. In working in a reservation school for many years and handling Indian education, I don't see our people being able to understand what we are trying to say by the first, second, and third. You know, I think everything is in there; I think that there is too much in there. I think about the school board that is going to read this report and they are only going to read two sections. They are going to read the introduction section, and they're going to read the summary section. That's all they are going to read. In fact, probably 75% of Indian educators will probably only read those two sections. I think it is of utmost importance that the introduction and every word must mean something. And, it has got to mean something to people in Indian country and what we truly feel about the Indian nations at risk. And then, they are going to go to that summary chapter or the summary and recommendations and look at the recommendations that take care of their concerns. And, we are looking at a lot of global things in a report. I believe with the supplemental material that he gave us when we got in, I have been wading

through it last night and this morning, and along with the stuff Bill gave us, I think we have got it all together as far as what we want to say. It has just got to be narrowed down and a lot of polish.

Ed Parisian called me and said he would like to be here but he wasn't invited.

Dr. Demmert: He blamed me.

Dr. Swan: And, he got a copy of draft 2. And, he was pretty upset with the report. He said, 'You can tell the Task Force that the BIA is not whimpish' (Charleston: the actual word used in the report was 'whimsical' referring to the frequent changes in the BIA acting director of education in the last ten years and the fluctuating BIA education budget). There are going to be things in the report that people are going to pick up. And, we talk about public schools in a certain way or BIA schools in another way against what's 'true' Native education; and, we are going to have a debate in this country with Indian educators. And, this Task Force went in a direction that they didn't want us to go in. I don't know how I'd 'give'm hell,' Ted and still be able to keep the report such that what we want to say. There is so much to say. The book is going to help, the supplement to the report. I don't envy Mike in writing this report. I don't feel that we need any technical writer. I think we have got it right now with our staff in D.C. I think we might need some assistance. I think we have got to get back to what Ted was saying: Every word in this report has got to mean something. And, there is a lot of things that we want to put in here, or you want to put in there, just to educate the non-Indian. And, I think that we are going to have to sacrifice and leave a lot of that out because, we can't say it all in one small report. I think we still have got to cut. But, I think that our most important sections are going to be the introduction and the summary.

Dr. Demmert noted that he handed out an overview of what the report should include and the perspective it should come from. This is an expanded version of his first draft. It is not a substitute for the report, but includes thoughts that should be a part of the final report. It includes legal issues taken from "Cohen's Handbook," cultural and academic concerns, major problems, what Native parents want their children to become, what schools can do, what the research says, and what the state and federal governments can do. There are a few pieces missing from all three versions that we need to identify. He suggested that the Task Force take a break.

Mr. Ely said:
After the break, can we discuss this issue of authorship. I think we have to come to a decision because the folks here are taking notes and if we are giving the notes to the wrong people then we are just wasting our time. I really enjoy your dissertation, Ted, but I've heard it five times. And we have to get beyond that and put it down on paper. This thing is so important. And, I don't think we are going to get another chance. It has to be done right. It has to be said right. Even though the ingredients are in here, it's like a cake, you can throw all the ingredients in and come out with a piece of garbage if they are not put together right. It has got to be done right. And, we really need to discuss that issue because we are going to be sitting here for the next sixteen hours, today and tomorrow, discussing this report. And, if all we do is say the same things over again, and it doesn't come out right; then, we are running out of time. Not just from the standpoint of this Task Force, but we are running out of time as far as our window of opportunity to improve Indian education in this country. We need to discuss it. We need to not be concerned about sparing feelings. This is important. We have to discuss these issues. And, we need to make a decision on that. I just don't think that Mike is capable of writing this report in a manner that will accomplish what we are trying to accomplish here. And, I think we need to lay it out on the table and we need to talk about it.

Mr. Sidney said:
Bill, I want to make a comment too. This is probably one of the best Task Forces that I have sat on in my career. And, a lot of it has to do with we have been very open and also the different backgrounds we come from. Probably now is the time for us to really exercise that. I'm not an educator. And, I've been involved in tribal government and always have been looking at it from that respect and how to influence Washington and the all-mighty dollar there. That's what we are really all about, and how to get that. However, I enjoy working with a major university in Arizona now. And, having educators agree, professors protecting their theory, and all that is something else. And, that is how I'm kind of looking at this now, you know. And, we could probably just write it such that it refers to the Kennedy Report but not really talk about it in such a way that people would say 'What is that Kennedy Report?' and having a sense of people wanting to look at it more.

The other area that I believe is the reason why sometimes reports are shelved is that we blame the government, which rightfully should be blamed, but we don't admit our shortcomings. I'm talking about tribal politics. Politicians change so fast on the reservation, you know, it just affects what's now the priority. And, if we have a report that's just going to blame somebody else and not what's at home, you know, it's not going to work either. So, I'm kind of looking for that to emphasize a little more what is really our responsibility. What's the parents responsibility? What's the tribal government's responsibility? And, yes, also for the federal government to be blamed. And, we have all the material here I believe. It is just that we get the people now to put it in a way that we are going to look at it. Partnerships is talked all over the country now. How do we obtain partnerships to get the things done? So, I just want to emphasize that we have been put on this committee from our different backgrounds and, I think, now is the time to really exercise that.

Mr. Fullerton said his comment would be rather brief. I thought the "Treaty of 1992" was negative and would be a turn-off. We are trying to reach the public and Congress. This is quite a task when we are only talking about 1.5 million people out of 250 million. Press releases always have at least one or two lines that are dynamite. If this report came out in Texas it would get no response because there is only a small Native American population. However, if the report addresses Indian education as a part of education in general, it will generate a big response. We need to reach politicians across the country even though Indians are concentrated in a few states. I hope we can revise the report so that it is dynamite, but not so negative that it will turn off the Anglo populations because that is where the power comes from to make changes.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy remarked that we have set in motion a process with unpredictable outcomes. If we have done our task faithfully we will generate an outcome that we may not expect. I challenge all Task Force members to think about the effect of this process on those people who have been in key roles, especially the staff. Are we saying what we have heard in the meetings and hearings, or what we think we need to say for immediate impact? Are we leaning towards PR (public relations) or to what people said? We need to have integrity in the report, and we cannot go towards one extreme or another. We have vested in this staff our faith to do the job, and they are the only ones who have had the full impact of the Task Force's work. We need to be careful not to water this down.

Dr. Demmert invited and recognized comments from the audience:

Robin Butterfield (a commissioned paper author in the audience) said that the "Treaty of 1992" assumes people act out of diabolical intent rather than ignorance. For the report to reach individuals in the field you need to separate depicting the negative from the possibilities of the positive. For example, the report can note the high dropout rate and the lack of parent involvement, while at the same time acknowledging the successes already made regarding these issues. The report has to build hope for people and momentum around our ability to grow in the future if we are given more resources and energy. I like the idea of using Indian education as a microcosm for solving larger problems.

Larry Belgarde (Stanford student in the audience) said that there are a lot of well-meaning Indian people, many whom have been in Indian education for 20 years or more. When we say that Indian education is in a deplorable state, we are talking about our own efforts. This paints a bleak picture. One way to move people is to present them with inconsistencies and show that there are good, well-intentioned people caught up in a system that paralyzes them. For example, at the BIA good people could not get things done because of the bureaucracy. The report should look at individual successes, but it also needs to look at the rotten system that we are all working in.

An unidentified student member of the audience recommended that the Task Force look at the resources offered at Stanford University when searching for an author. There are six to eight journalists in residence as part of the Knight Journalism Fellowship program. Some of them might be enlisted to highlight different approaches or even do some writing. This is not a matter of giving up ownership, but the report could be enhanced with available resources.

Dr. Ginsburg said that the Task Force should present an action plan. We want to be able to say that we know what the problems are and then present concrete recommendations to address them. Changes will not happen over night and they may cost money, but I would like to see concrete steps laid out.

An unidentified student member of the audience from Oklahoma said that he keeps hearing about things that the federal government can do--things that the government has a direct hand in. It seems that people know what to do, but getting these reforms into the public schools seems insurmountable. In gifted education many good ideas are discussed that Indian people have already done, such as cooperative learning and mentoring. But how do we get these into the public schools? I think it is helpful to look not just at differences between Indian and white communities but to also look at parallels. There are things that we have been doing for a long time that are regarded as innovative by the white community. These might remove some barriers and give us strength. I have a good feeling that people have ideas about what to do; they are just not able to do them.

Dr. Bell said he believes the federal government and Congress can mandate educational rights for Indians just as they did for handicapped students. States have to comply with federal law. I understand that it is hard to bring ideas into public schools, but if it is mandated in federal law, it will compel school administrations to address the needs of Indian students. If we can get rights specified for Native Americans, even if two students out of 1,600 are Native American, schools have to meet those rights.

At 10:45 am, Dr. Demmert called for a break until after lunch to allow Task Force members time to review the materials.

Tuesday, February 12, 1991 - Afternoon Session

At 1:25 pm Dr. Demmert called the session back to order. He asked David Beaulieu to read the following comments sent in a letter by Norbert Hill because he could not attend the meeting:

10 February 91

Dear Bill:

I'm sorry that I am unable to join you at the Task Force meeting. Below you will find my comments on the draft report. I find this very limiting because I'm not able to consider the other committee members' views and modify my notions.

A great deal of whatever we accomplish should be considered in the context of the national political agenda and government budget priorities and realities. The cities are dead--a 75 percent budget cut from the Bush administration means no help for the cities--it is therefore very unlikely that there will be any help for Indian people or reservations. I am upset by the thought of helping to rebuild Iraq and Kuwait after the war, which may be the decent thing to do. However, what happens to our people? The prospect of emerging legislation is dim with the federal budget deficit, the cost of war, the S & L crises, and very few people who really are concerned about Native people.

Where do we stand up and say, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH?

Mike Charleston is a fine writer. He has responded to the charge and direction of the Task Force and has captured the integrity and feeling of those who testified at the hearings. Mike might have gotten a little carried away with marketing our negative side--as real as it may be. I like the mainstream and assimilation arguments, the New Ghost Dance, the Treaty of 1992, and the Indian Bill of Rights. Tribal governments and the trust responsibility is a vital key...hooray. Education is linked to survival of Indian people and that is important for America. We need to capture the emotion and the hearts of the readers. The report might be too long--I don't have any suggestions for editing. We need more discussion about accountability and evaluation (more than page 45). Page 29, Goal 6 on science and mathematics needs more--it is too general.

How do we achieve our goals with such an honest and direct report? Do we want to make a statement or do we want to negotiate potential programs? A judgement has to be made about selling our soul. Those outside the Indian community have trouble dealing with the truth--especially education policymakers in this administration. Moreover, this is Cavazos' pet project. Does the current Secretary have Indian education as a significant priority? I don't think so. Part of my anger and cynicism is that this will be another report--as many of us predicted from the onset--and nothing much will be done. Therefore, it doesn't matter what we say in the report. We have nothing to lose. A compromised report diminishes our dignity--particularly to Indian people.

On the other side of the coin is hope. Costner's "Dances With Wolves" and the TV movie about Custer may have changed some attitudes about Indian people in general. America's quincentennial celebration could be used to our advantage to leverage educational change.

The fact is that we have to rebuild our communities--with or without a report, with or without government support. I recommend that we focus on the arguments of content versus values, and making professionals versus developing human beings. Let's think about unifying Indian people around a report that we can agree upon. I think we should ask for set-aside monies. How about an Indian program similar to FIPSE for innovative programs that can be institutionalized?

Dr. Demmert said that the focus for the afternoon's discussion would be on content. He suggested that the Task Force put together a comprehensive list of issues to be included in the report and a process for completing it.

Dr. Demmert said first he would like to ask Mike Charleston to discuss the background and thinking that went into the "Treaty of 1992" draft of the report.

Dr. Charleston said that he did not have a prepared presentation but could discuss the forces that drove the ideas and the writing. They were a mixture of materials gathered from his experiences, comments from the Task Force members at the Juneau and San Diego meetings as identified clearly in the notes he made on the proceedings of the meetings and returned to the Task Force members, the work of the commissioned authors, and that he was strongly influenced by the comments of the people who spoke at the regional hearings recorded in our proceedings. Taking the concepts and emotions and putting them together into the "Treaty of 1992" has been a difficult process. As the ideas were developed, they were shared with the Task Force members: in San Diego Task Force meeting, when he first talk about the "Treaty" idea, in the first materials in the December mailing of the commissioned paper drafts, and in versions 1 to 3 of the "Treaty" mailed as the separate pieces of that version of the report were being developed and written. The section on the tribal alliance was written within the last few days. And, of course, the whole thing it is not complete yet.

> Dr. Charleston discussed the "Treaty" version of the final report saying:
> What I would like to say in here is from the perception, from the perspective, of Native people in the country looking at the reality of Native education. If you could visualize Native education out here in the middle of us somewhere, and as we sit around this table, we look at it from many different perspectives. Each of those different realities will see a different item. I feel that part of my job, and part of the response here, is to try to express that from what we have heard in the testimony of Native people and from the perspectives that I have heard discussed here in our meetings and to blend that sort of urgency and reality.
>
> If I could call your attention to this visual summary (the Visual Summary in the "Treaty of 1992," see attached as an appendix document). This pretty well says the whole thing. I took some time thinking about this, the way this works. The terms here are strong. And, they are strong because it is my belief and my agreement with what I have heard you all say, that we need to have the power and the punch, that it has to get their attention. We start at the bottom. I called it the 'Secret War.' It is strong language. And, I believe that the situation is strong. I questioned it on the second page. What do you call it? Do you call it a conflict, a tug-of-war, the plight of American Indians? From different perspectives around the reality, we'll call it different things. From the Native people who live at Busby or Conehatta, Mississippi, or you-name-it place, it's difficult. These are life and death situations. It's a critical point. That is the reality. I put it in the Mother Earth position. This is the life that many of our people are living. It is the reality that has existed since contact with European societies. To many of our people, it is an intolerable situation that we need to change. It is literally killing our people. We look at the statistics that we would like to ignore and we would like to sweep under the rug or cover up, the fact is we have the worst living conditions in the United States. Our death toll today, this year, will exceed -- the rate of death among American Indians -- will exceed the death in the Persian Gulf. It is a greater rate of death than in the entire Vietnam War. We are losing our people at a phenomenal rate that would not be accepted in other societies. That is what I tried to set out as a justification for these strong terms.

Our hope, the sky position, is that we have hope and trust in these agreements that our forefathers on both sides have made through treaties and trust responsibilities. We believe that we can co-exist and live on this land. We put our confidence in the relationship between the federal government and our people. We have this issue that confronts our people, that I think we have never resolved quite satisfactorily. And that is 'What is an Indian?' And I will use another analogy here to try to elaborate on it. I think that the difference and the problem is similar to the difference between a Jew and an Israeli. We have a lot of Jewish people in this country that are solid loyal citizens of the United States. They practice their cultures in a whole spectrum of levels of what constitutes the reality of being Jewish. But, that does not make them Israelis. Israeli is an added concept of a member of a country. And, that they belong to this country. And, in fact, Israelis may not be Jewish. You know, they could be somebody else. I think a similar situation exists in our countries. We have Native people, Indians, and we have people who are members of tribes. And tribalism is important to me. And, I think that I have heard that very strongly in this room and from our people and from around the country. That is important. We do not exist with a special relationship with the United States without tribes. Without those tribes, we are simply like the Jews in this country. We are not 'Israeli' we are 'Jewish.' And, I think that the main principle that is guiding a lot of the strength here is that we are fighting for the existence of our country. And there is a considerable effort within the United States to change our people from being tribal people to being just Indians. They would like us to lose that nationality, that country, aspect.

In the medicine wheel, the circle here, I tried to represent our tribes; there are 28 little circles. And, they are in different states of condition. Some of them are virtually gone. Others are stronger and more cohesive. We have a great variety of tribal people; we have Indian people too, just as we have the Jewish people here. And, we should nurture and care for the cultures and the ethnic identity of Native people who are not members of tribes. So, we have around us, these realities of 'Indianism' and a whole set of different perspectives of what that really means.

At the four points, I have four things that I would like to say in this report. I will start with the industrial-age education system. A lot of this material came out of Berg and Ohler's paper. And, I thought they did an excellent job in trying to discuss the American education system. It needs to be reformed. We heard yesterday, as recently as yesterday, from the professors who spoke to us about the need to change the modern everyday education system to be more appropriate in serving the needs of all of our children and all of our people in the United States. We don't know exactly how to do that in many cases -- all of the implementation. We can name many of the things that need to be changed and what is wrong. And, we have a great effort initiated largely by A Nation at Risk that has brought this to the American public's attention. And, we are working on it. We need to contribute to that. Our people need to be able to participate in public school and in the American education system without being threatened in our existence. And, I want that choice. My children, right now, are in public school. I want them to prosper and to learn and to become solid Choctaw citizens and American citizens in that public school. That is not happening today. They don't like school. They were brought up in Choctaw; they were born and raised in Choctaw; and they feel threatened in that system; and, that is a bad situation.

On the other side of that spectrum, that line, I talk about Native education. And I use this fairly academic term that I too believe we need to change; but, for our purposes, I think that it is appropriate. It is 'pseudo.' It means fake, false. It isn't Native education. It is education for Indians. It is American education system. And, I maintain that I believe I have heard it stated in here and throughout our hearings that the purpose of this pseudo or regular education system for American Indians is assimilation. And, it is intended as a real true beneficial intent. This is what we need to do from the American's perspective sitting over here looking at Indian Ed. This is the solution: we need to assimilate people. I think that goal is directly opposite that of my people and a tribal society. Assimilation kills tribes. It is destructive to our folks and we need to prohibit the assimilation of our people into mainstream society. And, in fact, I strongly believe that a lot of the reforms in American education is to stop that process. We do not need to amalgamate all American people into this "melting pot" system of what is American. We need to be able to flourish in the multiple cultures that constitute American society. And, that, indeed, is American. That is democratic. There is nothing opposed to that process. It is a realization of the concepts of democracy. And, I want to see that instilled in our people.

I would like Native education, which I spent a great deal of effort in here trying to define what that means, to flourish within our communities, to be locally determined and locally defined -- this is the education for my culture and my people and for my region. And, I have the choice of sending my children to that education or to the American education public school where they can respect my culture and I can learn to live and be taught within the culture of American mainstream society or both. And, most likely, many of our people like all of us sitting around this table, most likely, have participated in both. I didn't get my Ph.D., and I probably never will get a Ph.D., at an Indian school. Maybe, if Haskell ever develops to that point, we can. But, it is unlikely. That probably isn't appropriate. But, I do want my children to learn my culture, to have my children speak Choctaw in an intelligent, academic, intellectual sense. And right now they can't. We haven't had that opportunity since my grandfather was in school. I want to move toward a solid education system with choice. The result of that will change, on the other dimension, a society in our tribal communities and in our urban areas throughout Indian country from dependency upon the federal systems and the social welfare systems, all of these sorts of negative aspects that typically characterize Native life in modern society to a more prosperous, self-sustaining, self-governing communities. And, we need education to get there. An important core distinction, that I feel is critical and that I have heard expressed here numerous times, is our cultures and languages. And, within that, I include throughout our writing here, our religions. Our value systems, that I think are critical and important.

Now, the first part is 'here's the problem,' here is where we are living, here's were we came from, and here's what is still the dominant theme within our education system today -- this is the bottom section [of the figure]. Our hope is resting in the federal execution and honoring our federal trust responsibilities and treaty obligations. That is what is driving our force. That is inappropriate. What I want to do is to move to the next level. Move up to a different world where that becomes the underlying philosophy -- that both the United States, the American societies, and our tribal societies can put our trust in the land and our relationships and our mutual co-existence of people within this country, given those agreements. I think that we need a lens, some sort of an action, an event that helps change us from the present situation into the future. We have had years and years of reports -- from reports of simply hostile actions against our people to the Meriam Report and the Kennedy Report. And each of them have helped. They have provided information. But, they have yet to change the real reality of the situation from my standpoint, from Conehatta or Busby or someplace, of being a desperate situation. And, that is echoed over and over; we need to change it. I proposed the "Treaty," and agreement to do that.

When we have this situation, at the top [of the figure], there is a driving force that I want us to follow. And, that is a more spiritual oriented, ethics, value sense pulling. Not just hope that the United States will comply with the treaties, but that we have vision and insight of what our communities ought to be and should be in a dynamic sense that keeps pulling us forward. I called that the 'ghost dance.' I think that it is significant that this is exactly 100 years after Wounded Knee. And, at Christmas time I was fortunate enough to be in Denver and participate in some ceremonies that honored the 100th anniversary of Wounded Knee. And, I think that is significant in our time. The ghost dance, a hundred years ago, represented this hope, this conviction, that things can come back to a normal, peaceful, abundant life of true Native people. Even though our people were living on reservations and were surrendering at that time to an alien society, there was some of this faith. Now the details of that, and I take very seriously the problems with the terminology, my people do not want our spirits to come back either and my tribe would have troubles with that concept, but the idea that there is a force, a vision, up here other than reliance on the federal government is important. If we keep that in dependency, we will always be in this subservient relationship. We have to have something more powerful than that pulling our people and guiding our tribes.

I want the relationship with our other people, the other societies, to be the base. And, I put that in the Earth position because it is based on the ground, on our land, and on the world here that we live in.

[In reference to the endpoints of the horizontal axis in the upper medicine wheel] I want us to have reformed public education with institutionalized, what I called quasi-Native education here. I can't expect, I should not think that any of us can expect, that public education should change into Native education using my culture or any other culture. It is American education. It should be respectful of my education. And it should teach other children, within education, the same sort of things that I want our children to learn and that we should learn about the other cultures of the world -- multicultural education -- a reformed system. On the other side, I need the choice of a true Native education that is locally defined by our own cultures and regionally defined by our own people and our tribes. And that will be very different in my home than it is at Zuni and Hopi and up in northern Alaska. You know, those are going to be very different. We need those choices and movement and opportunities to move back and forth. I want our people to come out of this situation with the type of quality education that will allow us to produce productive, self-governing, healthy societies within Native communities. And, we can move among all the societies within the United States. I want, obviously, like all of our people, that our kids speak English, that we are fluent in English, and that we can speak other languages too. I think that we need to be able to communicate well in all cultures. And, we also need to be able to develop the literature, and the drama, and all of those things within my own language. Right now, we can't do that. At Choctaw, we still have a strong language. But, we can't do that at Choctaw.

The most difficult one, I think, for all of our people to deal with is this center piece [referencing the center section of the lower medicine wheel in the lower figure]. In the center piece in the existing society, from my perception and from many of the people who spoke in our hearings, it's paternalism. The federal government runs most of the aspects of our life. And, they largely control it by budget. They control our money. And, throughout here [the report] I have added some graphs to show what our budget looks like. There is little that we are able to do in our society that is not affected by the federal budget -- by the control of money. I don't like that. It shouldn't be true. I want to move to self-sufficiency so we are not dependent upon federal paternalism. And, with all due respect, and I am a veteran and a loyal supporter of the United States and the Constitution and all of those kinds of things, but, I have yet to see the federal government succeed in educating Native children. They have not done that well. They haven't done it well in any area that I can point to. I don't think it's possible under that structure. The United States' dominant citizenship will not allow a federal run system of education for their children. If you took the citizens of Mississippi or Oklahoma where I am from and said the federal government is going to run your public schools, you would have a mass rebellion. They would not tolerate the federal government running public schools. And yet, we are asked to accept that. In the public school system some other government, the state, an outside agency, is running our schools; and, we have very little participation in it. We don't have people elected to the school board; we have advisory committees for federally funded projects. And, they exist there only as long as federal funds flow. And, those little project advisory committees get to talk to the school principals. We don't have that same relationship as other citizens. And, I maintain in here [the report] what I perceive; it's largely paternalistic problems.

Many of our tribes don't have the strength to operate these systems by themselves. The fact is we cannot just turn it over to tribes. Many tribes don't have the power and the strength and the coordination at present, and possibly even in the future, to do that. So, what I have proposed in here, and the hardest part throughout this effort, is to consolidate or to cooperate in our partnerships. It's an alternative system -- what I have called here a tribal alliance -- that provides a group of people that help support and administer locally controlled systems. But, its our own people rather than those with a conflict of interest in the federal system. Those are difficult terms. I don't know the answers to that. What I would like to do is to propose that to tribal people around the country to deal with -- that as an alternative to the federal system, we need some sort of a cooperative alliance.

I will conclude. What I would like you to see is that I truly believe that these are concepts and ideas that have been expressed well throughout our seven regional hearings. And, they are ideas and concepts that are imbedded throughout the messages that you have given us in our meetings in Juneau and San Diego. They come out very strong. I have used this language and this approach because I think it has never been said. And, it is this position, over here, that a lot of Native people have waited and waited and waited for somebody to do. And, it needs to be said. We have always relied on the Senate Select Committee or the Senate Committee with Mr. Kennedy, a very fine supporter. And, although it is important that federal people speak for us, or the Meriam Report, or other agencies, our people need to say these things. They need us to make those kinds of statements. And, it is not easy medicine to swallow for our people or for the other people. But, what I want to really be judged on in this is: 'Is it true?' It may hurt; but, to what extent is it valid and true? If it isn't true from the perspective of Native people, then it needs to fixed. If it isn't true because it doesn't support our cozy relationship with the BIA or our relationship with other folks, then I'm sorry folks, but this is the reality from our position in the tribes. It may not be the reality of the position of a federal bureaucrat or from a state agency or from public school officials. Their realities are valid and they are also true. We need to realize that there are multiple realities -- multiple realities and perceptions of what is occurring out here. And from our peoples' standpoint, I would like to provide this report to the Task Force to represent what I believe to be an honest and true representation of our perception.

Mr. Fullerton asked whether, even though what the report says is true, it will be effective in accomplishing what we want? Will it move anyone in the direction of change? I may know what is true, but if I'm not moved to change anything, we have not accomplished anything. Dr. Charleston agreed that we need to create an instrument that will effect change. We need to go beyond an inch-by-inch movement toward a solution. Since the Kennedy Report we have lost a whole generation. Most students did not graduate; of those who did graduate, many are functioning at an eighth-grade reading level.

Mr. Fullerton said that at first he felt out of place on the Task Force, but was told the Task Force wanted a different perspective--the Anglo perspective. I understand from the report that neither Native nor white students are being taught the Native culture in school. My question is: What do you want me to know about you? If you want me to know something, you have to tell me. I think I'm a good enough salesman to convince a high school principal to implement a good program developed by Native Americans. But I want to be able to go to that principal and say, "Your students need to know about the First Americans and this program has been developed by them." This is called self-help. If you want to accomplish something you need to take a more positive perspective. You need to be able to say, "I have something for you that you cannot pass up." I think Dan Rather would say the same thing. He is not likely to use such a negative report, and we need to get his attention too.

Dr. Charleston said that our task is to look at different perspectives and determine how to formulate the report so that it brings about change. It is vital that the report talk to all people. A large portion of our focus needs to be on Native people in order to get them to take responsibility for where we are now. It also needs to address Congress, politicians, and the media, but we are the ones who have to negotiate and change society. Our people should create multiple types of curricula to be included in public schools. My perception is that individual tribes cannot accomplish this. The federal government is inappropriate because we do not have a federal curriculum. However, an alliance of tribes can do this.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that many Task Force members use the personal pronoun "our"; often that is appropriate because we represent constituents. I am struck by the fact that this device is accurate. We understand the struggles, assimilation, and what the education system has done. The concept of a new Ghost Dance is a vision we've already had. We have always had a sense of what we want to see, and the Ghost Dance does capture the hope we have as reflected in new programs that are working. We need some way to organize all of these different aspects and the complexity of issues gathered from the hearings and the materials. I do not think this will suffice for the report. Things can be talked about in different fashions. One part that I find troubling is the device of a national alliance. This device propels a recommendation that not everyone is comfortable with. The underlying assumption is accurate, but the framework concerns me.

Dr. Charleston said that the most troubling part of putting this all together was the need to avoid replacing all of the federal bureaucracies with an Indian bureaucracy. It is a very difficult challenge to avoid duplicating what we have grown up with.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that as he listened to Dr. Charleston, it all made sense. The report does bring together the concerns we have heard in the hearings and over the years. What troubles me goes back to the purpose of the report and who the audience is. There needs to be a balance between Indians and non-Indians, educators, and non-educators. This is too much of a pill for people to swallow. You also need to consider the environment. This report was put together by you, but it must also go through the bureaucracy of the Department of Education (ED). This is too much for the bureaucracy to swallow. It would make a difference if the report came from outside the bureaucracy, but trying to influence the system this way from within is too much. This is like the conflict between theory and practice in which theory breaks down in practice. You need to go with what you think will truly make a difference.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the Task Force has a one dimensional view. We think in a very linear way, only seeing what is bad. It is important that we look at recent history. When my father was school-aged he could not go to school. To some extent the preservation of our culture had to do with the fact that the government was not doing anything. Today one-third of all Chippewas have at least one year of college education. We need to reflect the positive things happening and contrast the good and bad.

Mr. Lewis commented that we need to be honest and describe the circumstances in strong language. At the same time we need to provide hope and show that we have the power to change and transform reality. Given the length of the report and the need to explain concepts, it will go over the heads of many Indian people. We are looking for a way to put our foot in the door to change our relationships with schools. We need a very direct, forceful, proactive style so that people can know how to impact the system and create change. Describing tribal people versus Indians is too close a cut. We must not only consider tribal Indians or reservation Indians. There is a variety of Indians all at different degrees of "at-riskness." We need to be speaking to people who are currently positioned to translate it into action that will make a difference--school administrators, tribal leaders, congresspeople, politicians, and bureaucrats.

Dr. Bell said that everyone around the table had a different perspective of what the final product should be. This is like constructing a building when each builder has different architectural plans. I do not want to see a report released with all of us just hoping for a response. I do not want a report to go up to the new Secretary of Education, who will take it to the cabinet and then to OMB. It may be an advantage that the Secretary who appointed us is gone. My idea is for us to take our report to Senators--Kennedy is already committed--and ask them to introduce a bill, thus bypassing the executive level.

> I would like to see a law passed at the federal level that will protect the rights of Indian students, similar to those laws protecting the rights of handicapped and other classes of students. The federal government likes to pull tricks on the states, such as with P.L. 94-142. States must comply with the law or their federal funds are cut off.
>
> The more I learn the more incensed I become. I would like a report that we can use as a hammer to get things done.

Dr. Ginsburg said that in trying to submit this report to the new Secretary, he does not think that a national tribal alliance is a mission. It is hard to tell how Lamar Alexander will respond, but the tribal alliance goes beyond the scope of ED. I do think that the Bill of Rights is appropriate.

Dr. Charleston said he had no trouble with Dr. Bell's position on going to Congress and bypassing the executive branch. I have no confidence that the executive branch would do anything because they never have. My position in submitting these proposals to the Task Force goes even one step beyond that. I don't think that Congress can envision all that our people want. The initiative must come from tribal people. I propose that a new treaty may be a solution. Treaties are the supreme law of the land. The reason we do not write treaties anymore is due to a House Bill in 1871, during the Indian Wars, in which the House of Representatives reacted against the federal procedure of only the Senate ratifying the critical Indian treaties of the time. The 1871 Act ended 'treaties' and began the process of making 'agreements with Indian tribes' which were ratified by both the House and the Senate. The Supreme Court has ruled that an 'agreement' has the same force as a 'treaty,' and both are the law of the land. Through a treaty, both tribes and the U.S. government accept certain responsibilities. My position is that we must go beyond relying Congress because that is still being dependent. We need to do things as independent governments.

Mr. Ely said that we have to be careful because only individual tribes can deal with the federal government on a government-to-government basis. Only individual tribes can make decisions, not any coalition of leaders, not even this Task Force. What are we trying to accomplish, a national revitalization of Indian country? We have to decide what we can accomplish. Most people in this room are saying the same thing. The question is, are we saying this in the report? I think if we took a vote we would agree that it is not being said. We know the content, message, and what we want to accomplish. Now we need to figure out how to say it. From what I hear, the report is not saying what we want. Is the report repairable? If yes, then we need to fix it. If no, we need to go from here and write it so it says what we want. Dr. Demmert agreed that this report was not saying what the Task Force had intended.

Mr. Ely said that there were three components to consider: (1) do we agree on the content; (2) do we agree with the method, including the ghost dance and the alliance; and (3) do we like how it is said? We need to pick those three components apart and see what needs to be changed.

Dr. Charleston noted that there are two versions of the draft report available for the Task Force. He noted that the other version, "A Time For Change," did not mention any of the debated metaphors such as the 'ghost dance,' 'the secret war,' 'the tribal alliance,' and the 'treaty' idea. This other version takes a whole different approach and tone and is given as an alternative. Dr. Bell said that this draft was close enough that we could take it and go from there. He also suggested that Dr. Charleston work with a skilled writer who knows how to write for media headlines.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she came to the Task Force with the idea that we are speaking to a number of parties who are responsible and interested in the education of Indians, not just the BIA and ED. We can and should also speak to tribes and not let them off the hook. If there will be any creativity it will most likely emanate from the tribes. We should also look at the idea of reform versus scrapping the entire system and starting anew. There are examples of places that are starting over, where the entire curriculum was thrown out. We need to try to strengthen partnerships between families, schools, and communities. I am impressed that Mike Charleston analyzed things in terms of a struggle. It is necessary to talk about struggle because people are in the midst of a struggle in their personal and familial lives and we should not diminish this aspect. If it turns people away, that is too bad.

Dr. Swan commented that he appreciated Mike Charleston's words. He did better presenting here than he did in writing. I looked at both reports and both contain good things. I liked the graphs in the "Treaty of 1992" and hope they are in the final report. As a school administrator on the front line all of the time, and looking at other schools in the country, I cannot believe that we can operate a school the way we are doing and still be able to educate kids. We cannot say what a 'true' Native education is from a national perspective; it is a local issue. At Rocky Boy we are changing from a contract school to a public school to gain funding stability, because there is no stability in funding for the BIA contract schools. I did not know last year's school budget until the following September. This is a poor way to run a school. As we discussed in Juneau, if this report does not result in legislation, we will have failed. But we also need to affect change at the local level or we will fail. I agree with Dr. Bell's comment this morning that we must say it well in the first chapter or we will lose everyone's interest. We need to fine tune the introduction.

Mr. Sidney said he would like to see the Task Force rearrange the report and come up with a product we can agree on. I would like the report to be written in such a way that the tribes are the ones who read it and make changes. Changes need to come from the tribe; I do not expect the federal government to make the changes. We are all Native tribes, but we have different cultures. That is why tribes do not agree. We have a school in Hopi that is not even accredited. Students go to college and wonder why they are failing. I want to change this. I would like the report to contain findings and recommendations. I would hate to have someone come up behind us to do another report. The executive office put us together and if they were not sincere, why did they bother? If the Kennedy Report did any good, why are we still here? That is why change needs to come from the tribe. Maybe we can divide the work among ourselves with some working on the introduction, some on the findings, and some on the recommendations. We want this report to make a big impact. This report should serve as a foundation for the White House Conference.

Dr. Demmert noted that there are at least four issues out there, and there may be more:

1. Language, culture, and our identity as Indians are at risk and are being lost.

2. The schools have failed to educate a large number of Indian students. In Alaska 50 to 70 percent of the students in urban areas leave school between the ninth and twelfth grades. I assume this is not inconsistent with urban schools across the United States.

3. The culture of schools does not support Native culture in a way that provides an opportunity to use schools as a medium to continue the culture base and mores that are important to us as Indians.

4. There is an issue of funding responsibility. There are national, state, and local responsibilities, as well as tribal responsibilities. We can do anything we want if we can pay for it.

This is a Task Force report. Mike Charleston had the opportunity to put his thoughts in writing. I also have offered my thoughts on what the report should include. However, this in not Mike Charleston's report or my report. If this is not a Task Force report then I am not interested.

Our recommendations have to deal with the problems I identified and possibly some others. After a break we can begin to provide concrete ideas of what the report should include and how we will do it.

Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Tuesday, February 12, 1991 - Afternoon Session - Continued

At 3:10 pm, Dr. Demmert called the meeting back to order and suggested they discuss recommendations for the final report.

Dr. Beaulieu said that the Task Force needs structure before talking about recommendations.

Dr. Beaulieu said:
I uphold the idea that we in fact investigate the idea of getting someone with a journalistic background that can look at the issue of putting into the report that kind of a style. And, also, we would also create a subcommittee of the Task Force to assist and help in that to ensure that it comes and reflects the current opinions that we are going to in fact talk about today. And, that we begin to do that. That is a recommendation that I would like us to agree to as we begin. We need to quickly capture whatever themes we want, what the report needs to say, and have someone put that down.

Mr. Ely said:
Mr. Chairman, I so move that recommendation.

Dr. Demmert: Is there a second?

Mr. Sidney: I second.

Dr. Demmert: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion?

Mr. Ely said:
I would interject just to make it as clear as possible that the motion is to reflect the appointment or 'acquiration' or acquiring and appointing a writer to write this report in a manner that is essentially as described by Ted this morning and has a journalistic view as well as a political view of what we are trying to accomplish, and that a small subcommittee, possibly a number of three or four, working intimately with this individual to make sure that the emotions that have been portrayed throughout the hearings are also put in this particular piece and reflect the views of the Task Force. That is just a point of clarification. Now, I call for question.

Dr. Demmert: A call for question closes that off. May I keep that discussion open a little longer? Bob, then I would like Alan to respond to that.

Dr. Swan said:
Well, I disagree with a part of that motion. I don't think we need a journalist to write a report, our total report. I think the body of the report, a lot has been put together to date by the stuff that you put together Bill and what Mike put together. And, I'm still going to keep that same theme that it's important that the introduction be well written and well understood and it is important to have a summary. I don't think, necessarily, that we need a journalist to write the body of the report when we talk about some of the problems, the findings, and recommendations.

Dr. Demmert: Any other thoughts?

Mr. Lewis said:
I would like to ask Mike if, after hearing the discussion and a lot of thought about having the report rewritten to look and sound the way we want it to, to the variety of audiences that we have to communicate to, do you feel that you and your staff can be able to do that or accomplish that task?

Dr. Charleston said:
I think we can. What I have tried to do, what I worry about, and I think is the important issue here, is it was my effort to reflect the mood and the emotion and so forth of what I read and heard from you all in this one. For instance, this theme of battle, the metaphors of the war, are not my words. Those are words that came right out of the original version of the introduction. I rewrote them with the punch that I thought was appropriate. And, obviously hit heavy. What I'm not real clear about and I think that we need to discuss is: What is that tone? We have talked about the positive aspects and the modeling and so forth but those are sprinkled very lightly among other issues. So, I think that at the pleasure of the group, now I'm not pushing this at all, but at the pleasure of the group, I think we can reflect it when we have a better understanding and instruction and guidance on exactly what is that alternative approach. I offer it just at the pleasure of the group.

Dr. Bell suggested that the report have an executive summary written by a journalist with political savvy. Then we would have the report itself which would be larger and would have more prose. I would not want to lose the essence of the great material and emotion that Mike Charleston expressed because that touched me as one who has not grown up in Indian culture. One would give us PR clout, the other would be a broader report to live with. On top of that are our commissioned papers. On the other hand, maybe you just want the one report.

Mr. Martin said that his expectations of the process did not seem like those of other Task Force members. I never expected the first draft to be perfect. I thought that part of the process was to have a draft. I think that discussion is a healthy and necessary part of the process. Once we agree on the tone and content, then we can bring in a journalist to polish the report. I never expected that on the first draft we would say we are totally dissatisfied with this and we need to bring in somebody else.

Dr. Beaulieu explained that his intention was to add a writer to help with the journalistic style, not to replace the staff writers. The other issue is I also thought we should have a subcommittee that is connected with the issues to play an editorial role so we can have a more direct link in moving it along.

Mr. Ely explained that his intention was to have a person with political savvy who knows whose pockets to pick, how to get attention, and how to address Congress. This person would write the whole report so that it is consistent. I did not want to diminish the importance of other supplemental materials. As I think about the hearings and the distance that peopled traveled to testify, I think that we owe them the best possible report and the best chance at results. We need a writer who can grab attention and identify areas where there is the possibility of a response. This work is quality work, but it is not the best possible report to give back to Indian people or the best report to produce results. I think there are writers who can do this. A subcommittee is necessary, especially at this point of the game, to ensure punch and help decipher the material. I imagine the writer will be pulling pieces together from the drafts already written.

Dr. Ginsburg said that the Task Force has to make the White House Conference, and the report was promised by May. We need time to circulate the report and have people in the field respond. Realistically we don't have time to schedule additional Task Force meetings. We need to finalize the report. We need heavy involvement of the Task Force and we need a process to accomplish this now; otherwise we will miss the White House Conference which is supposed to carry forward the work of this Task Force.

Dr. Swan said the indication from Washington, DC, was that the White House Conference will not happen in August. I think it will be next Spring, and I do not think we have to follow the mandate to have the report ready before the White House Conference. I have a problem with the subcommittee because I think it is the responsibility of the entire Task Force to look at the drafts. We can get the drafts right away with fax machines. We should not put the responsibility in the hands of five people. We are 14 individuals.

Dr. Beaulieu said he was concerned about editorial issues such as the style of presentation and the tone of the report. The editing function is vital. We need interaction between the Task Force and the writing to be ongoing. The function of a subcommittee would not be to approve the final report; it would be to add to the existing effort. This would not take away from the overall efforts of the Task Force.

Mr. Ely: Question.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said:
I need to ask about the motion to clarify. As I understand the motion, are you making a motion to change authors or are you making a motion to add a journalistic kind of technical writer after the content is established because they are different things?

Mr. Ely said:
I'm making a motion to take this and throw it in the toilet and start from scratch with a new author.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy: You have never said that. That's your motion?

Mr. Ely: Ok, you wanted clarification. That's the clarification.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy: Fine.

Dr. Swan: Just one last comment, Bill, I think if we pass a motion such as this, I'm ready to revise my plane ticket and be on the plane tonight. Because, I see our role as being gone. What you are doing is delegating it to a professional journalist. You are also getting a subcommittee up that will take a look at the position of the Task Force.

Mr. Tullis: I'll go home too.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy: Question.

Demmert: Question has been called for by Janine Pease-Windy Boy. Make sure the minutes reflect that.

Dr. Bell: We can't have further clarification from the maker of the motion? I heard over here [from Mr. Ely] the comment that we 'take this and throw it in the toilet.' I wonder if that is David's.

Dr. Demmert: David would you like to.

Dr. Beaulieu: I didn't make a motion.

Mr. Ely: I made the motion.

Dr. Beaulieu: I just made a suggestion about adding some staff to give it some of the things that were recommended in the discussion.

Mr. Ely: I think it has to be trimmed down; it just has to be started all over. And, anyway, I think I have stated my point. And, I think there are many things in it that can be used but it is going to take a whole restructuring. This is written from page one to page what ever it is, seventy-two. And, it follows a pattern, so it has to be changed. And, that is what the motion is. So, I guess we can vote on that motion.

Mr. Sidney: I made the second to that motion. But, I got a little bit confused, Joe, when you said 'throw this in the toilet' because I understood you to say that this and all the others will all be used.

Mr. Ely: Well, they would all be used.

Mr. Sidney: O.K., and that I do agree that we need an editorial writer for the purpose of what Secretary Bell said. And, I guess I don't want to prolong this thing, but I just need to say it: that the educators have put this together. The people have spoken, we are at the point now where we are trying to affect the politician. And, that is why every tribal government hires a lobbyist or what ever to do that. And, I just see that we are at that point. And, I don't think at this point we need to say let's all go home. You know, we are savvy enough to understand that if we are going to influence, we have to go through that system. So, that is why I seconded it, not to totally eliminate anything. But, we are at that point that we need that service along with this for us to continue on.

Dr. Bell: Before I vote, Bill, I want to ask for one more clarification. Then, I'll know whether I want to vote for it or not. Was it the intent that this committee working with this writer with journalistic skills and political savvy would then complete the report and that would be done for us and the Task Force without us receiving during this time faxed copies and opportunities to interact with them and the Task Force would not meet again and give its final vote of approval and make amendments at that time? Was that the intent? I didn't think it was.

Mr. Ely: I would assume that as three or four pages are written that we would get them faxed to us. But, I would also assume that the three of four people on the subcommittee would be in telephone contact with the individual or be there helping that individual gather the tone that is necessary to write this and the emotions.

Dr. Bell: But, even after all of that, Joe, would we as a Task Force meet again, and heaven knows I don't want another meeting, and receive that recommended product that we had a chance to impact on and react to through the faxing and amend it as we want to and then adopt it as our report.

Dr. Swan: I don't see that in the making. I see what I understand is going to happen is that we are going to be meeting in May to release this report in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Bell: See, that was your understanding and it wasn't mine. If that was the intent, then I'm going to join with you and vote against it.

Dr. Demmert: Let me suggest that we break the motion into two parts: the first part deals with whether or not we would like to hire a technical writer, not a technical writer, a popular writer, to help us put this together in a style that we hope would have the public impact that we are interested in. That is number one. The second motion would be the establishment of a subcommittee from this Task Force to monitor the continued writing of that report in whatever form that takes place. Two different issues.

Dr. Bell: And then, Bill, would your intent be there that they be in constant contact by fax, FEDEX mail, and whatever else, with all members of the Task Force so that they could have input. And, would your intent also be that we meet again, if Alan can raise the money, to review and adopt the report. I don't want to have membership on and have a report out with my name on it, without my having approved it. I don't want to delegate that out.

Dr. Demmert said that his expectation is that whatever process we use--whether the report is written by the Department, a subcommittee, or a popular writer--that members of the Task Force will have the opportunity to review the report as it is being shaped and respond to the drafts. We will have the opportunity to see the report in its different stages of development, including the final report, and I hope the Task Force will agree through consensus to adopt the report. I hope we can put together a Task Force report that reflects the wishes and positions of the Task Force, that have come from a variety of sources including hearings, discussions, and personal experience. I do not see anything coming out unless the Task Force agrees.

Dr. Bell said that A Nation At Risk was scheduled to be released in March, 1983, and the President was scheduled to receive it. However, the commission was hung up 14 to 4, and they felt they would never agree. One member of the commission said that he could get unanimity if he had another month. The report could wait, but we would not be able to get the president. However, we postponed the report a month and did get unanimous backing from the commission. We also got the president. Getting unanimity is difficult, but not impossible.

Mr. Sidney withdrew his second.

Mr. Ely withdrew the motion.

Mr. Lewis suggested that since Task Force members agreed that the report needs another revision, the responsibility should be delegated to Mike Charleston and his staff and maybe hiring a consultant. Dr. Demmert said that he did not think they needed a to hire a consultant because there were many consultants sitting around the table.

Dr. Demmert said that he would like to take the rest of the day and the next day to focus on what to include in the report. Once we have the content, then we can talk about the process for getting the report out. We should read the different drafts that are here.

Dr. Charleston suggested that Task Force members look at the other draft version of the report, "A Time For Change," with your [Demmert's] new section which is a replacement of the front section of "A Time for Change." We can avoid dwelling on the same things that are pretty clearly rejected and move on to those things that we haven't looked at yet. The other draft version provided to the Task Force, "A Time for Change," does not contain any of the unacceptable points contained in the "Treaty." The second version of the draft report has a very different tone and not yet been discussed by the Task Force.

Dr. Demmert suggested Task Force members read "A Time For Change" and "The American Native," written by Dr. Demmert. The "Treaty of 1992" has been generally rejected. We will have a list of things that we agree upon plus the things we agree to highlight. We will trash those things that we do not agree on and then discuss the process. The Task Force voiced no objections to that process. Dr. Demmert then opened the discussion for issues to be included in the report.

Mr. Ely listed the following issues, noting that many of them had already been addressed:

- Parent participation and involvement
- Culturally based curriculum--curriculum that uses the culture
- Need for adequate funding
- Training teachers to incorporate culture into their teaching
- Preschool and daycare, including health and nutritional needs
- Personal and tribal responsibilities, including setting standards, funding, social guidance, and governance
- Definition of a practical need for education, that the end result be a positive contribution to society
- Need for adult basic education to pick up those who have been missed by existing schools
- Emphasis on what the American society will lose if we stay on the current course
- Benefits for American society if we make significant changes

Dr. Beaulieu added the following issues:

- Talk honestly about what we mean by "Indian Nations At Risk" in terms of individuals, families, communities, tribes, and cultures--what are the critical issues
- A vision that leaps above our parochial vantage points and allows us to take a leadership role
- Explain why our best ideas and creativity are isolated and their ultimate success is threatened
- In defining the problem, we need to acknowledge that the vast majority of students are being served by public schools.

Mr. Tullis disagreed with the last statement, saying that the demographics were distorted. The statistics indicate that there are 18,000 Indian students in the Alabama public schools and 19,000 in Louisiana schools. There are 3,000 from one reservation who attend BIA schools. There aren't that many Indian students in these entire states but nobody has the guts to say those numbers are distorted. Dr. Beaulieu noted that in Minnesota 97 percent of the Indian students were in public schools, but this may be a state phenomena. There was further discussion about figuring out the number of Indian students in public schools and the accuracy of these figures. Dr. Swan said that people are now claiming minority status for personal advancement.

Dr. Demmert questioned whether the Task Force was looking only at Indians with tribal affiliation or at Indians who have been exposed to European culture and are no longer grouped tribally. Only Indians who are identified with a tribe can have that special relationship with the government, and the BIA focuses only on those Indians. Title V looks at those without tribal affiliation if they can trace their ancestry back to their grandparents. It seems to me that we have to focus on the larger body. Improving education for American Indians must include individuals as well as tribal groups. We need to debate this issue and agree before we proceed.

The Task Force continued debating the number of Indian students served in public schools. Dr. Beaulieu said that his data came from the annual NACIE report. In Montana and Minnesota they know how to classify students identified by Title V, state law, and the BIA. The point, however, is where they are in school. There are 1,000 students in BIA schools in Minnesota. Mr. Tullis challenged that number, saying that if there were 1,000 students in BIA schools, and 97 percent in public schools, then there are 96,000 students in Minnesota public schools. These numbers do not jive. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy questioned whether we have sufficient data to make a point.

Dr. Demmert said that we can talk about numbers of students where we have reliable data. In Alaska out of a population of 131,000, 23 percent are Native children. Alaska has a breakdown of those eligible for the Alaska Land Grant Settlement Act and others who benefit as descendants. We have to recognize that it only serves the interest of the federal government to get us to play this game by fighting over who is an Indian because of the limited resources. If we get on that topic, we will not get to the issue of the report. Tribes cannot even resolve this problem.

Mr. Tullis said that the Task Force needs to recognize this problem before discussing solutions. If we don't know who Indian Nations at Risk are, we cannot make recommendations. This problem overshadows Indian country all over. When the Indian Education Act passed in 1972, it was to address children who could trace their Indian ancestry back two generations. Regulations were waived. Then the court ruled that everyone was entitled to services, so it keeps getting more and more diluted.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that Title V serves 350,000 Indian children in grades K through 12 using the law's definition, but there is no verification. The only requirement is that parents sign 506 forms to verify that a parent or grandparent is an Indian.

Dr. Demmert clarified that a student is eligible for Title V if he or she (1) is a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe, (2) is a member of a tribe pulled together under state auspices, or (3) is out of the Indian community but can trace Indian ancestry back to his or her parents or grandparents. In the BIA you are recognized with one-quarter Indian blood with the exception of the Pueblos and Arapahos in which children of women who marry outside the tribe are not recognized by the tribe. Dr. Swan noted that different tribes have different definitions.

Dr. Demmert suggested that the Task Force get back to specific recommendations. Dr. Beaulieu said that the point is a vast majority of Indian children--approximately 87 percent--are in public schools. Dr. Demmert said that the problem is that there are students from state groups, federal groups, and states such as North Carolina, Alabama, and Louisiana that have recognized Indian tribes that cannot trace their ancestry back to a particular tribe.

Dr. Beaulieu said that a central issue exists in the point about state public schools and lays the stage for a principal recommendation because a vast majority of Indian students are in state public schools, but the public schools are not adequately funded.

Dr. Swan said that if we take a look at the Kennedy Report at the beginning of the 1970s, this was an amazing decade in Indian education. However, the graphs on pages 18 and 19 of the draft portray the problems of the 1980s and 1990s. It all comes down to millions of dollars and cents. What this country did to Indians in the 1980s is the most terrible thing done to all people. It takes money to run schools and colleges. I want to see this in the report. Money is not the total solution, but it is an essential point to make even if it does not generate new funding. If it means doubling the budget, I am for it. If they can put

$500,000,000 towards bailing out the S & Ls, and if they can spend $30 billion to build B1 bombers, then they can bail out Indian education. If they can spend this money on defense, they can spend more on Indian children.

Dr. Demmert reiterated that Mr. Tullis wanted to include something on the definition of Indian, especially for states with tribes that cannot trace their ancestry. Mr. Tullis said he wanted to include this to show how much the money is diluted. Congress says they are putting large dollar amounts into Indian education, but when this is so diluted it loses effectiveness.

Mr. Sidney suggested that to expedite this process, Task Force members read from the final report and be able to refer to specific pages. Many of the comments being made are already in the documents. Dr. Demmert agreed and recommended that they work from "The American Native." Dr. Charleston noted that this piece replaces pages 1 through 17 in "A Time For Change."

Dr. Bell added the following issues to be included in the final report:

- Emphasize high level of literacy as a goal, both in English and in tribal languages
- Emphasize other academic proficiencies in the areas of math, science, and social studies
- Emphasize motivation of students to want to learn by offering rewards and incentives where they do not exist
- Provide access to higher education and access to financial aid
- Pursue set-asides in other federal appropriations such as Chapter 1

Dr. Charleston said that the graphs in "Treaty of 1992" had not been transferred to "A Time For Change," but they could be used.

Mr. Sidney remarked that Congress continually says they give increases in funding, but they cannot keep up with the Indian population. We are depriving the real Indians. This is a political issue no one wants to address. Maybe we need to change. We have money, but it is not being used correctly. Someone needs to write this in the report in a way that is not offensive, but is helpful.

At 4:30 pm, Dr. Demmert adjourned the meeting, asking staff to prepare a summary of the recommendations that had been made during the afternoon discussion. (See Appendix A)

Wednesday, February 13, 1991 - Morning Session

Dr. Demmert opened the meeting at 9:15 am, indicating that he, Dr. Ginsburg, and Dr. Bell had caucused the night before to lay out an agenda that would allow the Task Force to complete its necessary tasks by the end of Thursday's breakfast meeting. Accordingly, the following tasks were identified for discussion:

1. Review the Native Education Goals in "Time for Change" to assure that they are acceptable and appropriate
2. Review the Bill of Rights in "Time for Change" and with pieces proposed as additions

3. Review the Recommendations from "The American Native"

4. Review the section of "The American Native" entitled "What Do Indian and Alaska Native Parents Want Their Children to Become?"

5. Review the section of "The American Native" entitled "What are the Educational, Cultural, Social, Health, and Spiritual Problems Encountered by Students?"

6. Review the section of "The American Native" entitled "What Does the Research Say About Improving Schools and Schooling?"

7. Talk about kinds of examples the Task Force is interested in presenting with the final report (some from Dr. Demmert's piece and some that other members have suggested, like Dr. Beaulieu's concept of the past 20 years of effort and their impact).

Dr. Demmert asked if anyone wished to add to the list.

Dr. Charleston suggested that it would be useful to also look at themes for the report. The Meriam Report focused on the 'problems with administration' of programs, the Kennedy Report followed a theme of 'national tragedy -- national challenge,' and the more recent Canadian report's theme was 'a vision for the future.' We haven't agreed on a theme to organize our thinking about all of these issues so they will be linked to one another. We may want to focus, for instance, on the 'Bill of Rights,' but we need a unifying concept, a theme, so that when people look at the title and when they finish reading the report their thoughts will be focused around the theme we have chosen.

Dr. Demmert agreed that this was a good idea and that it might be the 'Bill of Rights,' 'excellence in education,' or some combination of those and others that have been discussed.

Dr. Tippeconnic agreed that the theme was critical, especially if the Task Force wants the report to make a big splash. It is important to think in terms of the media headlines that the press will pick up. There is also a need to (1) decide what the flow of the various sections will be and (2) identify strategies for implementation.

Dr. Demmert noted that in his piece there was a possible theme suggested in the notion that 'loss of language and culture puts peoples' identity as Indians at risk.' There is a piece in the "Cohen Report" on this, suggesting that language and culture are the basis of our special relationship to the government; without these elements that relationship is lost.

Dr. Demmert then suggested that they begin working through the list by reviewing the Goals as drafted on page 26 of "Time for Change."

Dr. Ginsburg noted that when the Goals were originally drafted, no special attention had been paid to their order. He suggested that this also be considered since people might assume the order implies a prioritization.

Dr. Demmert recommended the group move quickly through the goals and then determine if any of them should be given a high priority status or if they should be rearranged.

Mr. Martin wondered if the Goals should not be connected to the problems. Dr. Demmert responded that there should be clear links between all three key elements: the problems, the goals, and the recommendations.

Goal 1: Maintaining Native Languages and Cultures

> By the year 2000, Native students will be educated in schools that use their Native culture to teach and will learn about their Native languages and cultures. Native and non-Native students and teachers will acknowledge, appreciate and respect the cultures and languages of Native peoples, the dynamism of their cultures, and their past and potential contribution to American society.

Dr. Demmert proposed that rather than saying "students will be educated...." the phrase should read "*schools will offer the opportunity for Native students to learn...*" He also proposed that this say "schools will *reflect* their culture," rather than "teach." These changes are important if the goal is intended to indicate that communities and students have the choice.

Dr. Beaulieu added that at least schools should not be corrosive to Indian students' and communities' efforts to maintain their own language and culture. Dr. Demmert asked if Dr. Beaulieu was suggesting that schools "should not" be the vehicle by which language and culture are conveyed. Dr. Beaulieu replied that at minimum schools should not operate programs that eliminate Native language and culture. Mr. Lewis noted that those who are running the schools have a responsibility to create an awareness, an understanding, and appreciation of the value and importance of these languages and cultures.

Mr. Ely noted that there is a paragraph in "Time for Change" that says almost perfectly what members are trying to express here--that schools should not be an arena for carrying out the destruction of language and culture.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that he liked the use of the word 'dynamism' because it conveys the idea that Indian cultures are alive and well and contemporary, rather than static or dead and lost in the past. This gives us a sense of being able to grow and learn from our own cultures.

Dr. Demmert asked if anyone had a problem with the order of this goal. Mr. Ely said he did because he believed that Goal 4 should be the first goal since it reflects the most basic concepts of survival as human beings (being able to feed, clothe, and house oneself). He noted that this should be a primary goal because we need to solve this first, then we can turn to academic achievement and social development and the development of skills like math, science, and reading as elements that feed into this.

Dr. Demmert said it could well be that establishing a cultural base is key to academic achievement and therefore is as important or more important initially to reaching the academic base Mr. Ely is talking about. Mr. Ely agreed that language and culture are paramount to learning but was unsure that they would lead to academic achievement, social development, and ability to survive as adults.

Dr. Swan urged that they not get bogged down in ranking the goals since everyone would have different ideas. He suggested it would be better to preface the goals by noting that each should have equal weight. Otherwise we might never reach agreement. Mr. Ely agreed with this suggestion.

Mr. Lewis asked if we are assuming that the existing BIA and tribal schools are adequate or are inadequate and in need of restructuring. This is a goal that should have as much significance as language and culture. If it isn't expressly stated, people will dismiss it. Dr. Bell suggested that this was something that could better be included as a means of reaching the goals, perhaps in the section on recommendations. Dr. Demmert asked Mr. Lewis to draft a statement that would express his concern.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that the introduction could describe a sense of logic in terms of how the goals hold together. Dr. Demmert asked him to draft a statement that would do this so that Task Force members could respond.

Goal 2: Readiness for School

> By the year 2000, all Native children will start school with a solid foundation in their Native culture and language and will be ready to learn. The elementary schools they attend will be prepared to provide an education appropriate for their individual level of development.

Dr. Demmert noted that the language of this goal is similar to that of the first goal and he would personally prefer taking a different slant. He proposed that the goal should talk about the importance of parenting and early childhood education that is linguistically and culturally appropriate to the child.

Mr. Ely wondered if that wasn't really a part of Goal 9. Dr. Demmert disagreed, saying it was specific to early childhood education. Mr. Ely asked how they intended that Goal 2 be accomplished. Dr. Demmert responded by saying they should recommend that every Native community and tribe have early childhood education programs. Mr. Ely then suggested they be more specific and talk directly about early childhood education. Dr. Demmert said that the goal does this but uses the phrase "readiness for school" because it fits with the language of the national education goals.

Mr. Tullis noted that very few tribes have early childhood education programs, but that is one area where tribes and communities should assume a major responsibility. This would require redirection of some resources in order to make it happen. Dr. Charleston said that most existing early childhood programs are funded as Head Start programs operated out of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Dr. Demmert proposed that the language read "*Every Indian tribe and Native community will develop an early childhood education program that is culturally and linguistically appropriate.*"

Dr. Ginsburg observed that the national goal also talks about health and nutrition and that these might also be added. Mr. Tullis said he regarded all of these as essential parts of early childhood education programs.

Dr. Bell said that research is now placing home and family in the center of this rather than Head Start. When I was in college we learned that IQ was fixed at birth, but we have now learned that the brain grows dramatically in the first five years of life and if there is intellectual stimulation during this time, the synapses become even more quick and sharp. Benjamin Bloom, Piaget, and others say that if you are taught and stimulated at home the IQ grows. Parents need to be aware of this and think about it. There have even been training programs developed on this, so I can see where Native parents, and especially mothers, could really do something with this. You may want to add something on training Native parents.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that in Minnesota they have started a small program last year that brings in the Elders to works with young mothers. However, they do not yet address the issue of raising the IQ.

Dr. Bell said that he used to be cynical watching young mothers talking to children when they are too young to understand, but his own research has really convinced him of the value of this. Dr. Demmert added, as a point of interest, that there is now a new theory on the development of the brain which suggests that it is not so much a matter of growth of synapses but, rather, may be related to certain fluids.

Mr. Lewis said that it was important to consider the links between family, preschool, and elementary schools and how to strengthen these connections. Dr. Denmert said there was something on this in the recommendations, but perhaps it should also be in the goals since we want to emphasize the importance of having the family at the center of the process.

Goal 3: Reading

By the year 2000, Native children will have mastery of reading and language arts skills appropriate for their individual level of development.

Dr. Demmert noted that Dr. Bell had earlier mentioned the need to refer to *"achieving high levels of literacy (reading, writing, and speaking) in both English and the Native languages."*

Mr. Hamley (Harvard Native American Program) pointed out that not all tribes have readers in their own language. Dr. Demmert added that some cultures go way beyond the written word when they think of reading, applying it to the ability to read the snow and the weather, and so forth. Dr. Bell wondered if any Native languages had developed computerized language programs.

Goal 4: Graduating High School Students with Competencies Needed for the Future

By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate for Native students will increase to at least 90 percent. The quality of education they obtained in high school will prepare Native students with the skills and knowledge needed to enter adult life as a contributing member of the Native and non-Native societies.

Dr. Bell wondered if it would be important to put something in here about Native students being able to compete with the best at universities like Stanford. Dr. Tippeconnic indicated that he and others who had had dinner with Stanford Native American students the night before had heard a lot from them about their own college preparation experience. Some said they had really lacked the math skills to make the transition from high school to college.

Dr. Beaulieu shared his view that it was important to preserve the idea of a need "to enter adult life as a contributing member" and not focus in on one particular path such as college. Mr. Lewis wondered if preparation for college and continuing education would fit more appropriately into Goal 7.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Tippeconnic to draft a statement that would work in the student concerns they had heard the previous night.

Dr. Beaulieu recommended that they include a statement to the effect that students must stay in school from kindergarten until they graduate or reach 18 years of age (which is a new policy in Minnesota), so they can't escape at 16 as many currently do. Dr. Demmert asked him to draft a statement that would cover this concept.

Goal 5: Student Achievement and Social Development

By the year 2000, Native students will demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, technology, history, social studies and geography. Every school responsible for educating Native students will ensure that Native students learn higher-order thinking skills and are able to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for ethical, moral, and responsible citizenship and leadership and for further learning and productive employment in the modern tribal, national and world economies.

Dr. Beaulieu asked if this was also similar to one of the national goals. Dr. Bell indicated that this was so. Dr. Beaulieu noted that the last part had been added and it was an important concept but he felt it was awkwardly stated. It comes across as old-style thinking--that students are empty vessels waiting to be filled.

Dr. Charleston indicated that the language of the last sentence had come out of Norbert Hill's concern at previous meetings that this go beyond rote memorization, repetition and other lower- level thinking skills and get into synthesis and other skills at the top level of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Dr. Demmert proposed that the language be changed to say that schools "*will continue to promote development of higher-order thinking skills.*"

Goal 6: Science and Mathematics

> By the year 2000, Native students will have mastery of challenging curricula in mathematics and science appropriate for their individual level of development. The number of Native students earning degrees in mathematics, science, business, engineering and medical fields will be in proportion to the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Lewis wondered if this were not already embedded in Goal 5. Dr. Ginsburg responded that the national goals break out math and science and that the Task Force had also wanted to break out reading to increase its significance. Dr. Demmert asked if members wanted to collapse Goals 3, 5, and 6. Dr. Beaulieu argued that Goal 3 should stand by itself because of its importance.

Dr. Charleston recommended they request Norbert Hill to expand Goal 6 since he has done some thinking on this concept. Dr. Ginsburg wondered if they might consider having objectives under an overarching goal to accommodate these concerns. Dr. Beaulieu suggested that it was inconsistent to separate out math and science and that to do so ran the risk of forcing kids into these areas. He wondered if it could be supported without giving it parity and recommended that the statement reflect the need to increase the numbers of students and not say "in proportion to the rest of the nation"--in other words just drop the language after "medical fields."

Dr. Demmert asked if the goals should be merged or kept separate. Dr. Beaulieu favored their merger. Mr. Ely felt that Goal 5 was important enough that it should stand alone. Goal 5 is extremely important because it is about preparing students for adult life, while Goal 6 is about studying a subject. Dr. Bell agreed with Mr. Ely, adding that math and science are so important that they should stand alone.

Dr. Demmert wondered if technology ought to be moved over to the science and math goal. Dr. Bell felt it should be part of preparation for life, since without some familiarity with technology it was no longer possible to do even basic things like setting your Seiko watch. Mr. Tullis argued that these concepts should be included with Goal 5 since separating them might imply that those who pursue careers in math/science areas don't have to be responsible leaders or citizens. Dr. Bell agreed that academic achievement and social development should apply to everyone, including those who specialize.

Dr. Demmert proposed separating academic achievement from social development and that the first concept be merged with Goal 6. Everyone agreed that this was a good idea.

Mr. Ely asked that the term "higher-order thinking skills" be eliminated because it continues to imply that if thinking isn't higher-order it is lower-order. Can't we just say "*thinking skills.*" Dr. Demmert proposed it be changed to "*creative and critical thinking skills.*" The group agreed that this change would address their concerns.

Goal 7: Adult Education and Lifelong Learning

By the year 2000, every Native adult will be literate and will possess the necessary academic, vocational and technical skills and knowledge to contribute to tribal, national, and global societies and exercise the rights and responsibilities of tribal and national citizenship.

Mr. Lewis questioned whether the Task Force could reasonably assume responsibility for every Native adult in the country. Mr. Tullis proposed it be changed to suggest that *"the opportunity be created for Native adults..."* without implying that we should drag them in off the street. This was agreed upon.

Goal 8: Safe and Alcohol/Drug-Free Schools

By the year 2000, every school responsible for educating Native students will be free of alcohol and drugs and will provide safe facilities and an environment conducive to learning.

This was accepted as drafted.

Goal 9: Parental, Community, and Native Involvement

By the year 2000, every school responsible for educating Native students will be operating in responsive partnership with Native parents, Elders, tribes, and Native community leaders. The tribes and Native communities will participate in the governance, evaluation and certification of the operation and performance of schools educating Native students.

Dr. Demmert suggested that this one needed work, although he was not sure what changes would be best to strengthen it. Hayes Lewis agreed to work on a revision.

Goal 10: Preparation of High Quality Native and Non-Native School Personnel

By the year 2000, every school responsible for educating Native students will recruit and retain well qualified Native teachers, administrators, and ancillary personnel in proportion to the Native student population in the schools. Universities, colleges, and schools will educate, train, and certify Native and non-Native school personnel to be sensitive and respectful of the Native language and cultures of the Native students and prepare them to educate Native children using culturally relevant and academically enriched curricula.

Dr. Demmert observed that this was a good goal, but it too needed tightening. Dr. Beaulieu proposed adding the concept of "effectiveness" to being able to teach. Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Charleston to work on it so it could be reviewed later.

Dr. Ginsburg proposed that the Task Force consider adding a statement at the end requiring that every three years a national report be issued including accountability measures to document progress toward the goals.

Dr. Charleston requested further comment on the notion that the number of Native teachers recruited and retained "be in proportion to their Native school population." He stressed that this idea raises the serious issue of quotas. Mr. Ely said that there should be no quotas. Mr. Lewis felt that school boards should reserve the right to hire the most competent staff, saying that without this you would easily get into a situation where the tribes become hiring organizations. Dr. Swan said he had a major problem with dropping it because of the current disproportionate number of Native school administrators, board members, and superintendents in his own state. Dr. Ginsburg suggested they talk about "*significantly increasing*" the number. The Task Force agreed to this idea.

Dr. Demmert noted that they still had a total of 10 goals and asked if there was a need to add any others to the list.

Dr. Swan indicated he was unsure about it belonging in the goals or the recommendations, but he felt it was important to look at education as a part of the federal trust responsibility.

Dr. Demmert said he had addressed this in his version of the report and wondered if this was insufficient. Dr. Swan thought perhaps it should be included in the Bill of Rights. Dr. Demmert asked that Dr. Swan draft a statement to address this concern.

Mr. Ely cautioned that if it was included in something that might be proposed for becoming legislation, such a statement could bog things down. Dr. Charleston agreed and said that this had also been a concern addressed by the Confederated Tribes in Canada. The problem is that if you permit Congress to legislate such a thing "in," they can also legislate it "out." Some factors like trust responsibility go beyond this and should not be up for debate. Dr. Beaulieu agreed that it needed to be addressed but not in the Goals or the Bill of Rights. Mr. Ely suggested that it be stated as a "fact" rather than a "goal" or proposed "right," because it is an important and key concept.

Dr. Demmert suggested the members read his proposed introduction to see if he had expressed it adequately and then share their thoughts about any changes they felt would strengthen coverage of this issue.

Dr. Demmert then asked that the discussion move on to the Bill of Rights, as drafted on page 51 of "Time for Change." (See Appendix B)

Dr. Charleston explained that he had added number 6 in response to discussions held in San Diego and number 7 in response to testimony offered in St. Paul regarding urban Indian education.

Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Wednesday, February 13, 1991 - Morning Session - Continued

Dr. Demmert called the meeting back to order at 10:40 am, again directing the discussion to the Bill of Rights.

Dr. Tippeconnic observed that the wording of the headline on page 51 of "Time for Change" really makes a difference. It is important to have this headline reference "American Indians and Alaska Native Students" because it makes it very clear who we are talking about. Mr. Tullis agreed and Dr. Charleston suggested that the phrase also be added to the Goals. There was general agreement with this suggestion.

Mr. Ely suggested that where these rights reflect a goal, they should correspond in number so it looks better cosmetically. Dr. Demmert said that where they are the same, they should be examined to determine if they are really a right or a goal. Dr. Charleston thought that the Task Force needed to make a clearer distinction between the two. Dr. Demmert stated that goals are not guarantees--they are something we are working towards, whereas rights are guarantees--things we ought to be able to expect.

Dr. Ginsburg noted that when the Bill of Rights idea was proposed by Dr. Bell, he was coming at it from the perspective of Public Law 94-142 which talks about a guaranteed process as well as the need for IEPs. In fact, it is the process which drives the legislation. The Task Force needs to question how this Bill of Rights will relate to a guaranteed process.

Dr. Demmert agreed that Dr. Bell should share his thoughts on (1) the "Bill of Rights" and its implementation, (2) what should be included, and (3) the relationship of the Bill of Rights to the Goals.

Dr. Bell reflected that in his career he has watched how various lobbying and special interest groups have won rights for certain segments of the population.

> But it was never done more thoroughly than under the Ford Administration when the Education for All Handicapped Children legislation was passed. Those who drafted this bill legislated-in very specific things that had to be done for these students. To some extent passage of the bill represented Congress's lashing back at the states for all of the neglect that had been documented in public testimony. They drafted the most comprehensive education bill ever passed. Then Lau v. Board of Education came along, and bilingual educators were able to get some of their concerns addressed.
>
> As I think about our mission, I think, why can't we do the same thing for Native American children. In effect, PL 94-142 and the Bilingual Education Act spell out a bill of rights for their constituents. The point I would like to make--looking at the draft on page 51--is that I want us not to miss an opportunity to prescribe every right these kids deserve (the same rights that have been won for others). By precedent we would have a powerful wedge with Congress because we could say, "Look, you've already done this for these other groups."
>
> The Handicapped law actually required that:
>
> 1. School systems and states must conduct a survey of this client population to identify them. In other words, they must seek them out.
>
> 2. Schools must then do an individual assessment of the education needs of each identified student.
>
> 3. Schools must bring in the parents and others prescribed by law, to develop an individualized education plan (IEP).
>
>   Schools must also make certain efforts to get the parent involved. People were skeptical about how this could be done. There are close to five million handicapped students (which exceeds by threefold the entire Native population) so if 94-142 was do-able, we can also mandate this, and it can be done.
>
> 4. If certain deficiencies are identified, then the schools must take care to remediate them. Some school districts were angry about what they might have to do for individual handicapped students. Nevertheless, schools are required to carry out the IEP and to press hard to assure that each of these students receives an education commensurate with their needs and abilities. Now with access to computers, there is enormous potential that did not previously exist for addressing certain kinds of handicaps.

5. There must also be a state plan that serves as the umbrella for the school district effort. This plan must include identification of problems and needs.

This was a powerful law and if we could spell out a similar prescription for Native students it would be a wonderful "ace in the hole." We could then tie this Bill of Rights to the Goals.

Dr. Demmert indicated that three appropriate recommendations had come to mind as he was listening to Dr. Bell:

1. The first statement in the Bill of Rights is on target.

2. We need to add the word "*plans*" to "individualized education" and add "*health*" to the list ("intellectual, social, etc..,") in the second statement.

3. We should add a right to specify implementation of the IEPs by local schools and a state plan to monitor that implementation.

Dr. Bell added that there should be a right to have your needs assessed (as the number 2 statement) and then to have an IEP developed on this basis (as the number 3 statement).

Dr. Swan said that from a practical school administrator perspective, he has a problem with this idea. If we want an IEP for every Indian student and for handicapped and gifted students it is going to create a bookkeeping nightmare. It could also confuse a lot of people, so I am not in favor of an IEP for every Indian student.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that there are existing processes that need to be improved and enforced. We could say that every Indian student has a right *"to have his or her needs assessed accurately with appropriate services provided in relation to cultural identity and academic needs."*

Dr. Bell said that if we had the handicapped legislation before us it could be suggestive of what we might want here.

Dr. Ginsburg proposed consideration of a provision that would allow substitution of a building-plan based on academic needs assessments in cases where there are significant concentrations of Native American students. He noted that the problem with IEPs is that they are very short term. Perhaps the Task Force could correct some of the deficiencies. Dr. Swan argued that there would still be a problem with singling out students in the large schools with small numbers of Indian students.

Mr. Lewis said that the concept was strong, but that the problem was in implementation; perhaps there might be other ways to meet the same needs. In Zuni high school students are assigned advisors who then meet with them to design a four-year plan before school starts. These plans include a career path. Then the advisors meet with the students and their parents or guardians to explain and discuss the plan. In this way they build in accountability and get the parents and the teachers more involved in the process. But there has to be a way to maintain this accountability. The existing mechanism in the 874-IPP (Indian Policy and Procedures) document gives a lot of authority to the tribes to determine the effectiveness of the programs. Two years ago in New Mexico 28 districts serving Indian students were found to be out of compliance. We took a two-page checklist and reviewed it for each school district and all of a sudden they were decertified and no longer eligible for Impact Aid. This was a major threat. Consultation is at the district level and the document is reviewed with the tribal council--the budget ties to the plan with provision for sign-off from the tribal council.

Dr. Ginsburg asked if they reported on the plan from year to year. Mr. Lewis said that they did and that some priorities change each year.

Dr. Beaulieu said that although the IEP of special education may be the wrong process, still the Bill of Rights should be assurances of what Native children are entitled to expect. A school plan would be appropriate with parental and/or tribal sign-off. The Bill of Rights proposes assurances that local districts must guarantee.

Dr. Bell noted that when the Education for Handicapped Children Act came before Congress he testified as Commissioner of Education and said that they were trying to act like a big school district and it would be impossible to do this on a national level, that school districts would never comply, but ultimately they did so because they had to.

Mr. Lewis pointed out that a Bill of Rights will have to be implemented; in New Mexico it would go to the State Board of Education for approval and then the state would be responsible for implementation. On the BIA side it would have to go through the Department of the Interior and the BIA-OIE and then to the tribal schools in a way that they would be held accountable and could not respond with a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. As an aside, Dr. Bell mentioned that New Mexico had been the only state to refuse compliance with 94-142 until they were pressured with loss of funding.

Dr. Charleston said that there was already an accountability provision in 874 but that the Indian Policy and Procedures provisions are not enforced. Impact Aid says they have had no complaints, which really means that no tribe has been able to master the formal complaint procedure.

Dr. Beaulieu commented that Minnesota now has a law requiring each LEA with more than 10 Indian students to form an Indian parent advisory committee which is then charged with advising the district on all aspects of the system. This is seen as a vehicle for broadening parent involvement, which includes required needs assessment and long-range planning. In other words, the entire school district plan is a proposal for critique and advisement, not just the Title V program.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that if a single proposal could substitute for IEPs it could be more meaningful and possibly more effective.

Dr. Demmert then proposed that the discussion move away from the Bill of Rights and on to Recommendations. He asked Hayes Lewis to chair a session with Robert Swan and David Beaulieu on the Bill of Rights issue and suggested that Joe Abeyta (Santa Fe Indian School) might be able to join them to discuss in detail what would work best.

Dr. Charleston indicated that one distinction he has heard here concerns whether education for Native American students is different from education for the general population. This can have a bearing on teacher training, content and methods, just as it does in special education for handicapped students.

Mr. Martin pointed out that the more recent trend in special education has been to improve the regular classroom so that there will be less need for resource rooms. This same principle may apply for Indian students.

Dr. Demmert suggested that we need a two-pronged focus:

1. changing public schools to be more multicultural in nature so all cultures are reflected in terms of curriculum, structure, and perspective; and

2. an approach that says all kids (not just Indian kids as a group) have different learning styles which need to be accommodated (This would acknowledge that the environment in which kids grow up has an impact on their motivation and on the way they perceive things).

Mr. Martin reminded the group that they had talked in Juneau about avoiding stigmatizing Native children. Mr. Ely said that if we have a Bill of Rights and get new legislation, we will certainly not avoid identifying Indian students and separating them out.

Referring to the handicapped legislation, Dr. Bell noted that the concept of "least restrictive environment" conveyed the sense that students should be mainstreamed wherever possible.

Dr. Demmert asked that members keep this in mind and ask how we can change the situation in SEA and LEA plans to improve the quality of Indian education. He asked them to think about possible criteria for development of plans that would assure that children weren't negatively stigmatized. Dr. Beaulieu added that we did not want to fall into the mistakes of Chapter 1 by pulling kids out to provide services.

Mr. Ely recommended that the Task Force take a break to reflect on these issues and discuss them with one another so that they could bring their considered ideas back to the table after lunch.

Members agreed to this suggestion and Dr. Demmert called for a break at 11:30 am.

Wednesday, February 13, 1991 - Afternoon Session

Dr. Demmert called the meeting back to order at 1:25 pm to resume discussion about the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Lewis reported that his group had discussed the Bill of Rights in the light of PL 94-142 and felt that IEPs were inappropriate for Indian students. They proposed instead that the Bill require a school district-based accountability plan. They asked for help in determining what components would need to be included to cause LEAs to focus on academic, social, language, and cultural needs of Indian students. At least plans would need to be community- and tribal-based and must include assessment procedures and some kind of sign-off and/or sanctions.

Dr. Beaulieu said they had talked about the notion that school-based plans need to be comprehensive in nature and based on accurate assessments. They could be pushed in connection with federal dollars. When a district has a large number of federal programs, there is a mechanism to impose compliance. The Bill of Rights would be a statement of assurances we want LEAs to address in working with tribes and communities. The planning process would be school-based with sanctions (i.e., loss of federal money) included as a club.

Dr. Demmert suggested that the next step would be to identify the components of the Bill of Rights. He asked if the small group had any examples. Dr. Beaulieu referred to the Bill of Rights on page 51, saying that these statements weren't too far off but needed to be stated in a different sense. We have to draw a clear distinction between goals and assurances we seek from LEAs.

Dr. Demmert then asked for comments or proposed changes in the wording of the statements on page 51. He asked for responses to Right #1 saying that perhaps it was acceptable as stated in the draft.

1. The right to safe and intellectually demanding schools that are culturally, linguistically and developmentally appropriate to their individual tribal identities and lives;

Mr. Lewis indicated that he would prefer to break Right #1 into two separate parts because there is so much in it.

Dr. Beaulieu said that he had a problem with the word "safe" in Right #1 because it seems like another thought, one that would justify a separate statement. Mr. Ely agreed adding that "safe" was more related to facilities. Dr. Demmert argued that "safe" had psychological, emotional, and environmental aspects and referred as much to staff and student attitudes and senses of security as it does to facilities. Some schools in larger cities are dangerous to attend. Mr. Fullerton suggested that they add the word *"environment"* to "safe" to capture the broader sense. Members agreed to this amendment.

2. The right to individualized education that develops a wide range of intelligences and that challenges each individual Native student to achieve his or her maximum in intellectual, social, physical and spiritual development;

Dr. Swan said that the only problem he had with Right # 2 was the idea of IEPs.

Dr. Demmert proposed that Right #2 read *"right to appropriate educational opportunity based on assessment and a responsible partnership with Indian communities"* rather than the language requiring an IEP.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested they require that districts have goals and objectives, an assessment process, a plan developed in light of the assessment, and services designed to meet needs identified in the assessment. Perhaps the sequence should begin with the assessment. In this regard, he said he wasn't sure they were finished with the goals. There is a sequence of activities we want to see happen and they need to be clearly stated.

Dr. Beaulieu wondered if the word "individual" in line 2 of Right #2 meant that they were still talking about serving each individual student. Dr. Demmert asked the group if they wanted to leave it as written or change it to the concept of *"school district plans"* or *"appropriate educational experiences and opportunities that develop a wide range of intelligences...."*

Dr. Charleston noted that many schools would say they are already doing this. He added that he was troubled with the term "opportunity" because it was so suggestive and full of potential loopholes. Mr. Ely added that "appropriate" raised the question of who would define what is appropriate.

Dr. Demmert modified his proposed language to read *"right to an educational environment that develops a wide range of intelligences...."* Dr. Ginsburg questioned if the right was to *"appropriate services"* or an "appropriate environment." Mr. Ely wondered if they needed to get so tied up in the actual language of the statements, saying that if this were going to be taken into legislation they would need the help of a lawyer.

Dr. Demmert replied that since it would be the driving force of the final report, they would need to be very clear. He read another version of Right #2: *"The right to an education that develops a wide range of intelligences...etc.."*

Dr. Beaulieu liked the word "develops." Dr. Ginsburg restated his concern that Right #1 talks about schools and the environment. It will be difficult to draw a distinction if Right #2 does not specifically talk about *"services."* Dr. Demmert added that schools with academic programs but not the safe environment would not succeed, so it would be important to see these as different. Dr. Beaulieu agreed that they should be separate.

Mr. Ely asked if by "spiritual" they were referring to religion. Dr. Demmert said they were not, and that "spiritual" was used here to mean "sensing one's place." Mr. Ely asked how it would be interpreted by school administrators. Dr. Demmert said that they were using the word in a more traditional sense and that, in general, Native communities believed there was a link between physical being and the natural world. Dr. Charleston said that in this context "spiritual" was used in a more open sense, which could also include spirit on a football team. Mr. Ely argued that in Indian culture "spiritual" has a direct tie to religion and he wondered if we could ask schools to do this. Dr. Beaulieu wondered if the word *"psychological"* could be substituted. Dr. Demmert suggested they leave this for now and circle the word as potentially problematic for later consideration.

Mr. Martin asked if the words *"multicultural education"* could be worked into Right #2. Dr. Demmert suggested it might fit in Right #1 and then asked if Mr. Martin felt it was not already covered. Mr. Fullerton cautioned against creating a document that tries to be all things to all people and therefore will not work.

Mr. Martin explained his view that Indian education has to be in the context of multicultural education in the public schools. Dr. Beaulieu thought it might fit into the double objective of enabling students to live in both worlds. Dr. Demmert asked that they hold this thought and see if it could be accommodated.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that if they are to develop a plan that hold people accountable, there must be something specific about *"schools"* in Right #1 and *"programs and services"* in Right #2, instead of using only the word "environment."

Dr. Demmert said he viewed Right #1 as speaking to the need for educational systems congruent with children's backgrounds and able to speak to kids vis-a-vis tribal identity and their personal lives. Right #2 talks more about the character of the program itself. Dr. Beaulieu favors the word *"environment"* because it is less limiting.

Dr. Charleston suggested the group list the Rights they want to talk about and discuss the language later. He proposed starting with following:

Right #1:	Safe environment/schools
Right #2:	Appropriate linguistic/cultural approach
Right #3:	Intellectually challenging programs

Dr. Beaulieu mentioned that in Minnesota by definition "equal educational opportunity" means that Native American students must have access to language and culture programs in their schools.

Dr. Charleston asked for clarification on whether or not the group wanted to talk about "individualized education." Dr. Beaulieu said he wanted to keep this concept in the Bill of Rights so that each student would be guaranteed a program to meet individual needs.

Dr. Demmert asked if they were still using the phrases "wide range of intelligences" and "...challenges each individual student's needs." Dr. Bell concurred that there was a need to preserve the individual aspect of this with respect to a wide range of learning styles.

3. The right to continued development in school of their knowledge and abilities to function as contributing members in all governmental, economic and political aspects of both tribal and mainstream American societies;

4. The right to continuing education throughout adulthood that meets their individual needs for adult, vocational and technical, postsecondary and professional education;

5. The right to high quality academic programs that are tribally certified to meet the linguistic, cultural and educational needs of Native students;

Dr. Swan said he had a problem with Right #3 in terms of the word "governmental." He suggested it should read "social, economic, and political aspects..." instead. He also raised his concern about using "tribally certified" in Right #5 and proposed they substitute *"tribally sanctioned"* instead to avoid running into problems with state departments of education.

6. The right to respectful, fair and equal treatment by all school personnel and other students in the schools they attend; and

Dr. Demmert referred to Right #6 wondering if it should read *"equal treatment and opportunity"* or "fair and equal treatment." Dr. Beaulieu said that by definition in state board of education rules that every student must have equal access to educational opportunities suited to each student's unique individual needs. This would be suitable for Indian education also.

Mr. Martin indicated that he liked the use of the words "equity" and "equality." He added that when you have fair treatment and equal opportunity, that is what constitutes equity. Dr. Demmert noted that most of the group agreed that these words are needed, but there was still a question about how to fit them into the Bill of Rights.

Dr. Bell raised the issue of a student who might be having trouble in algebra and would need special help in order that his opportunity be equal...so in these cases "equal" means "more" than the regular program. Dr. Demmert agreed that we need to include the concept of extra support where it is needed.

Mr. Ely said he viewed use of the word "equal" as potentially nullifying the entire Bill since it would be most frequently defined as "same." Dr. Bell suggested that they add *"commensurate with needs"* to avoid this problem. Mr. Fullerton suggested *"appropriate to meet the needs,"* saying he would hate to go to a school that was equal to one down the street that was considered to be lousy. Dr. Demmert wondered if *"appropriate to meet the needs"* was strong enough.

Dr. Bell pointed out that when a wealthy family has a child who is not making it in school, money is no object. They hire expensive tutors to help out. If this strategy is good enough for a millionaire's kid, it ought to also be available for Native American students. Mr. Ely proposed that they talk in terms of making the end results equal. Dr. Beaulieu added that Native American students should have the right to resources sufficient to meet their needs.

Dr. Demmert suggested they might want to add a statement that talks about the right to stimulating educational environment at birth so that the importance of early childhood education and school readiness can be guaranteed.

7. The right to attend quality schools with other American Indian and Alaska Native students in their communities to support the continued use of Native languages and expression of cultural values and behaviors within a Native social group.

Dr. Beaulieu proposed adding to Right #7 the right to come together in cities despite desegregation. Mr. Tullis noted that this concept ties into "school choice" and we need to make it possible by deleting the phrase "in their communities." Dr. Beaulieu observed that this Right also supports tribal schools.

Dr. Demmert suggested they change "quality schools" to read *"high quality specialized schools."* Mr. Tullis countered that most specialized schools were a rip-off. Dr. Beaulieu said that the notion here was to allow schools to be developed where they don't already exist.

Dr. Charleston said that using the term "specialized" brings in the unresolved issue of whether or not we want Indian education programs to be different or in the midst of mainstream education with enrichment opportunities provided, as they are at South High School in Minneapolis.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that they were talking about a right (that is different for Indians than for other groups) to develop Indian schools that are publicly funded.

Dr. Demmert proposed language as follows: *"The right to attend high quality, culturally-based schools with other American Indian and Native Alaskan students to support the development of Native language and expression of cultural mores within a Native social group"* and that they substitute the word *"development"* for "continued use."

Dr. Demmert asked that the discussion move on the Recommendations.

Recommendations

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that the Bill of Rights was almost a part of the Recommendations in terms of encouraging systematic reform. You have goals, then the Bill of Rights, then processes and means of enforcement. The Recommendations have to pick up on these Rights so that there is consistency and continuity and it can be viewed as a whole systemic process.

Dr. Swan indicated that he would have to leave soon and before departing wanted to make some comments about the Recommendations drafted on pages 52-53 of "Time for Change."

> Recommendations 1, 2, and 3: There is a problem with the Indian community misinterpreting this language and thinking that ED is going to step in and take over all of Indian Education. This would provoke a big fight again because it doesn't appear to leave any responsibility with the (Department of the Interior (DOI) and the BIA. With 180 schools we mustn't let the BIA off the hook.
>
> Recommendation 4 talks about plans; if we have this kind of recommendation then it needs to be supported with appropriations.
>
> Recommendation 7 should include reference to the BIA's postsecondary institutions.

Dr. Tippeconnic agreed with Dr. Swan that this language must include the BIA. He preferred to see the first recommendation broken down with coordination as a separate item and with waiving of federal requirements also as a separate item.

Mr. Tullis agreed, adding that if this were to go out tomorrow, it would agitate a fight as to who is responsible for educating Indian children-- the BIA or ED? As soon as I show that most of the money goes to public schools, tribes will interpret this as meaning that all money will go to non-Indian schools. They will ask what we mean by taking all of the federally funded programs away from the Bureau.

Dr. Demmert suggested they break it into three parts and be clear about ED's focus on their part and BIA's focus on their part. He then wondered about sticking all of the Indian education programs and BIA programs under a separate agency and asked what the climate was for doing this. Dr. Swan felt it would take us back to the 1970s and talk then about an independent agency. It would not be politically realistic. Any change you propose in this area would be fought by tribal councils since they tend to be very conservative. Mr. Ely agreed that we would do more harm than good.

Dr. Demmert asked about the notion of appointing an Assistant Secretary. Dr. Beaulieu said that they should recommend this, but they would need to carefully define the mission of an Assistant Secretary. Dr. Swan agreed that there are many programs in ED and set-asides (Vocational Rehab, Vocational Ed, etc..,) that should be handled by a new Assistant Secretary.

Dr. Beaulieu emphasized that they also need a separate statement regarding coordination between agencies.

Dr. Charleston shared his concern that they were skipping a similar problem in BIA with chronic program instability and annual staff turnover. Dr. Demmert proposed that Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Tippeconnic and himself talk with Ed Parisian to get his ideas on stabilizing the BIA-OIE and then circulate them for Task Force input.

Dr. Swan reiterated the need for a very catchy theme. He suggested that perhaps *"500 Years of Genocide - Time for Change"* might work. He also asked if the final report was still scheduled for release in May. This was confirmed by Dr. Ginsburg.

Mr. Ely suggested that the Task Force provide members of the audience an opportunity to share their thoughts. Dr. Demmert invited Mr. Hamley to share the concerns that he and others had raised in discussion the night before.

Mr. Hamley (Director, Harvard Indian Program and member of the audience) indicated his primary concern with higher education issues, some of which had been covered and others that needed to get on the record for later review:

Regarding graduate and undergraduate education (not including tribal colleges and community colleges) -

Graduate Education

1. There is a need to reexamine the special program models that have provided leadership training at institutions like Penn State and Harvard. The existing programs, which were very successful, have been diminished, yet they are an essential piece of the picture. The government needs to provide adequate funding for administrative staff, support staff, and scholarships. There should also be more research fellowships made available to Native American graduate students.

2. Graduate schools need to place special emphasis on the certification of principals, superintendents, and other school administrators in Indian country. Special emphasis should also be placed on certifying women in these positions.

3. Something should be done to address the extreme under-representation of Native American college and university professors. There is also a problem with self-identification vis-a-vis who is actually Indian and consequent unreliable data. There is a need for mentors and

professional organizations where senior Native American faculty can be mentors for junior faculty.

4. There is a need for an Indian Research Center or think-tank. The one at George Washington University will include an education policy program, but educational issues are very complex and there is a need for a center that focuses on just Native American education and policy issues. We could use the state centers as a model. We could also start with just one demonstration center perhaps linked to an Indian college. Its purpose could be to serve the needs of tribal educators by examining practical issues that they have no time to research.

Undergraduate Education

1. There needs to be more early identification of Native American students for colleges.

2. Native American college students need more support as they proceed through school--perhaps with additional programs like American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES).

3. Native American parents need to be educated to expect college education for their children.

4. There should be increased funding and scholarship money available through BIA and OIE. There is a need for a realistic financial needs assessment to arrive at realistic grant amounts which would enable students to make it through college. The existing needs assessment is not tailored to Indian students because many have families, yet they are required to spend 70 percent of their award directly on education. Excessive parental contributions are required relative to Indian parents' ability to contribute. The rules governing over-awarding are so tight that they do not allow the flexibility Indian students need in order to make it through. The high number of Indian college students who are single parents is also an issue, since they are penalized for earning extra income which would make up the difference in their awards and their expenses.

5. There should be a loan forgiveness program for students willing to work for their tribes or in colleges on post-doctoral research.

6. Recruitment and retention programs should be enhanced nationally. There should be research on what works since there is still a very high dropout rate. Additional support services are definitely needed.

7. We have never taken a hard look at the alumni from earlier programs at Harvard, Penn State, etc., to see where they have gone. I look around this table and see many graduates of these programs and recognize the valuable network they represent. If these programs are not funded and at a more adequate level, what will happen to the leaders of tomorrow?

Dr. Beaulieu thanked Mr. Hamley, saying that these were excellent recommendations, some of which had been previously discussed and some of which covered additional concerns. They are all very vital, and certainly the leadership programs need to be sustained.

> It is true that the university has the ability and time for research. One effort, begun years ago at the University of Minnesota, was designed in response to Native Americans who had been asked what U of M could do to address their issues. They had requested development of a language maintenance program as their top priority. This project successfully developed many fine instructional materials and language tapes in Ojibwe, but it has now been reduced to one instructor.

There is a need to look at funding so that the maximum benefit is to students and not to the universities they are attending. It would be important that BIA support be used to replace loans rather than scholarships. This could be very helpful and it would not cost the government any additional money.

Mr. Hamley concurred that the problem was to get institutions to support Indian education. Harvard, Penn State, University of Alaska at Fairbanks, and Arizona State are examples of institutions that support Indian education through loan replacement. Dr. Charleston noted that Penn State Indian students have free tuition. The university receives only the 8 percent indirect costs for its Title V grant. The balance goes to support the program.

Mr. Tullis indicated that he had a problem with encouraging more research because so many studies have already been done. We know what the problems are; we need to get on with solving them. It is necessary to keep our perspective. If we have a goal of getting more money, we should look for ways to maximally address the problems we face.

Dr. Beaulieu asserted that the universities have a vital role in the economic health of the communities they serve. Many Indian communities do not share in that. But we need to enhance the relationships between universities, Indian communities, and Indian schools to support research that will help them address their own policy issues. When the research is studying situations in the Native community as a means to helping resolve problems, it is not exploitative because the information goes back into the community rather than being taken away for use elsewhere.

Mr. Hamley said he strongly favored the kind of research Dr. Beaulieu had described. It should be practical, usable, functional, leading to outcomes of strategic value and including a dissemination component. Dr. Demmert agreed that for survival, tribes needed the opportunity to have access to such research.

Mr. Lewis referred back to BIA-Tribal scholarships, saying that there is a need to educate the tribes regarding the costs of different institutions. Some tribes have arbitrary limits to their awards which prevent talented students from attending schools like Stanford. Tribal councils have traditionally taken a narrow view on this issue. Dr. Bell said he had had the same argument with David Stockman who insisted that there was no need to help students obtain anything more than a "Chevy education." He was opposed to supporting students who wanted to go to Berkeley. This is an age-old argument that there is no need for "Cadillac" institutions.

Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Wednesday, February 13, 1991 - Afternoon Session - Continued

The meeting resumed at 3:10 pm. Dr. Demmert directed members' attention to the Recommendations drafted in his version of the final report.

Recommendations for the Federal Government

1. Establish the improvement of schools Native children attend and improved academic performance of Native children as the Nation's highest priority for federal services to the American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

Mr. Lewis recommended that the phrases be turned around so it reads "Establish *as the Nation's highest priority......the improvement of schools...*" Others agreed with this change.

2. Authorize the establishment of an Assistant Secretary for the Education of American Natives in the U.S. Department of Education to provide direction and coordination for improving the quality of schools serving Native children; to coordinate and provide oversight responsibility for all federal funding appropriated for the education of Native children and adults; and to coordinate federal requirements with state and local education agencies. It is recommended that the Assistant Secretary for Native Education be authorized to waive federal requirements for educational funds going to schools for Native children when schools develop comprehensive plans to improve the quality of education for Native children, and when those plans have been approved by the Assistant Secretary.

Dr. Demmert noted that this had been addressed in earlier discussions and that it would be divided into three parts, limiting the scope of the Assistant Secretary to programs under ED [except for those out of Department of Labor (DOL) and Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)], so that BIA funds would be separate.

Dr. Tippeconnic observed that some of the recommendations related to ED, others to the BIA, and some could be generalized across both agencies. He wondered if they could be grouped according to this principle. Dr. Demmert said that this was a good suggestion and they would keep it in mind.

Dr. Tippeconnic also stressed that coordination was a very broad issue but it should also be spelled out for ED and BIA in specific terms. He added that he would like to see research and evaluation added to #2 as an area to be addressed by ED although it is also addressed in #10. Perhaps #1 and #10 could be merged. Dr. Demmert said they could be merged or a clearer distinction could be made between the two.

3. That tribes, Native communities, and parents of Native children be given authority, in partnership with schools, to participate in the development, implementation, and evaluation of local and state plans; that their approval of such plans be required before the Department of Education receives and considers such plans for waiving of federal rules and regulations of federal requirements over educational programs serving Native children and adults.

Dr. Ginsburg again urged that the recommendations be integrated in such a way that the whole document would have a logical flow. A plan should be in place to achieve the goals which are assured by the Bill of Rights.

Dr. Tippeconnic reiterated Mr. Martin's earlier concern that this document not be limited to an articulation of the responsibilities of the state and federal government.

Mr. Fullerton wondered if the phrase "be given authority..." should read "be given authority *and responsibility...*" Dr. Charleston noted that the tribe already has authority by virtue of treaty rights. The important thing is that our people need to take responsibility for exercising these rights. Congress does not grant tribal authority.

Dr. Demmert said that the point here was that if we, as tribes and as individuals, elect to take federal funds, we take them with strings attached and we need to be provided the opportunity to sign-off.

Mr. Ely favored making it a two-edged sword with both "*authority and responsibility.*" This really means a shared responsibility. Using both words gives the statement more weight. By accepting the authority, the tribes should be willing to assume the responsibility.

4. Require the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Department of Education (ED) to develop specific plans and programs to increase the numbers of Indian and Alaska Native students attending our Nation's colleges and universities. These plans must be in operation until such time as the numbers of such students entering and graduating from institutions of higher education equal the percentages of all postsecondary students generally.

Dr. Beaulieu questioned the idea that there should be a limit or planned phase-out of this effort, proposing that the last sentence be deleted.

Mr. Fullerton suggested that colleges and universities might also be required to have aggressive recruitment plans. Dr. Demmert felt that this might be more appropriately added to recommendation #11, which could also include some of the recommendations presented by Mr. Hamley.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested they expand the statement by saying "attending *and graduating...*"

5. Promote the training of Native educators for elementary, secondary, and university teaching as a national priority.

Approved as drafted.

6. Promote the training of American Native professionals in science, mathematics, engineering, medicine, law, business, the social sciences and related fields as a national priority.

Approved as drafted.

7. Require that federal programs providing social service support to American Natives develop partnerships with tribal groups, with schools serving Native children, and that these partnerships give the highest priority to prenatal care, parenting and early childhood education, and health care for expectant mothers and young children.

Approved as drafted.

8. Provide for the establishment of early childhood education, prenatal care, and parenting programs that are linguistically, culturally, and developmentally appropriate for Native children in every Indian reservation and Alaska Native community.

Approved as drafted.

9. Provide for the establishment of a foundation program for the operation and maintenance of the tribal community colleges to strengthen them as learning centers for the tribes that they serve; centers for strengthening language and cultural priorities of those tribes; and centers for political and economic development for tribes that they serve.

Mr. Tullis expressed his appreciation of this recommendation and especially its reference to economic development.

Dr. Charleston asked for clarification regarding the meaning of "foundation program." Dr. Demmert said it referred to establishing a funding formula to provide long-term program stability. It could be an endowment, but the exact nature of it is not yet determined. Mr. Ely added that this wording gives us flexibility to come up with different types of funding.

Mr. Martin asked that it include reference to Haskell and other federally funded postsecondary institutions. Mr. Lewis proposed the language be changed to read "tribal community colleges *and federally supported postsecondary institutions*."

Dr. Charleston wondered if the statement is too vague and might be construed by the American Indian College Fund as competitive with their organization. Dr. Demmert said that he saw a "foundation" as a way to fund the operation of schools (which could include facilities) and to provide them a stable base of support. He suggested they ask Janine Pease-Windy Boy to respond to this and recommend any adjustments that might be needed.

10. Insure that the Native Education Goals established by the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force be given a high priority in local and state plans and objectives developed for the improvement of schools serving Native students.

This statement is to be merged with #1 as suggested earlier.

11. Authorize the establishment of a National research and school improvement center for Native education in the Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education, to serve as a resource center for schools educating Native children; for state departments of education, for universities, and as a source of funding for research designed to improve education programs and academic achievement of Native students.

Dr. Demmert indicated that this one was newly added to recommendations in the previous drafts.

Mr. Lewis asked if this center was intended to operate out of ED or to link up with existing community-based research models like the American Indian Center for Excellence in Albuquerque, New Mexico. He favored the later approach so that they not set up an agency in Washington, DC, to do this research for us. Dr. Ginsburg and Dr. Bell were asked to clarify this concept.

Dr. Bell referred to the existing network of research labs and centers, suggesting that this would be another center. Dr. Ginsburg added that it should include a technical assistance provision which would allow the research to be more helpful to local areas. He said that he viewed it as a group of institutions under the auspices of OERI.

Dr. Beaulieu stressed the importance of being clear about this center's focus on research that addresses real issues faced by American Indians and Alaska Natives in their schools and communities. Dr. Demmert agreed that language was needed to specifically include community-, tribal-, and school-based research.

Dr. Tippeconnic asked if this would also include national longitudinal studies such as those that are ongoing in ED and deal with issues of concern to Indian education but have insufficient Indian samples. Dr. Demmert said that this could happen with a coordinating role in ED and a Center Director. Dr. Beaulieu said that they should find a way to ensure that existing research efforts have a set-aside to address Indian populations.

12. Provide long-term discretionary funding for a limited number of model projects designed to improve schools and academic performance of Native students.

Dr. Ginsburg noted that model projects should include a strong independent evaluation component and a strong dissemination effort to widely share the exemplary practices developed under this fund. He also suggested that this should go with the research center program so that there is a means for feeding good ideas back into the system.

Other Federal Recommendations:

Mr. Fullerton wondered if it would be worth adding a recommendation on training of non-Native educators. Dr. Demmert said they should write that down under #13 in a statement that would also ensure that multi-cultural principles are included in teacher training. Mr. Lewis asked how this could be implemented. Dr. Demmert suggested they look at set-asides in existing programs and where none exist, go for legislation to accommodate this concern.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that the recommendations provide for comprehensive gathering of statistics on Indian student performance and preparation of a report every three years to describe progress made in achieving the Indian education goals.

Dr. Beaulieu proposed a recommendation to articulate the unique political status of American Indians and recognition of their unique needs, especially in terms of the desegregation debate, so that some leadership would be provided in resolving these issues.

Dr. Demmert proposed two places where this could be addressed: in the section on current status and where state and local plans are discussed in the light of possible waivers of federal regulations. He advised against highlighting this concept because it might provoke a fight.

Mr. Martin wondered if the problem of limited access to higher education had been addressed in the recommendations. Dr. Demmert said they would be adding recommendations to cover this.

Mr. Martin suggested that there should be a recommendation to address the backlog of facilities.

Dr. Charleston asked if they had clearly discussed set-asides and if they were included under waivers. Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Tippeconnic if he had any special thoughts on set-asides and he indicated that his office was not currently involved in set-asides.

Dr. Demmert said that this was a part of the concept of coordination and asked if there were specific pieces of legislation where they could look for set-asides. Dr. Tippeconnic recommended Bilingual Education. Dr. Charleston brought-up NCES, noting that American Indians are subsumed under the category "Other" because they say there are not enough Indians to justify a separate sample.

Dr. Demmert wondered what the set-aside possibilities might be in money going to higher education, especially in terms of institutional and fellowship support. Dr. Bell said that under Title III a precedent has been set regarding Historically Black Colleges, so perhaps there could also be a set-aside for Indians. Dr. Tippeconnic added that this legislation was being reauthorized this year. Dr. Ginsburg suggested they also look at the Trio programs, adding that this was an issue Norbert Hill could speak to.

Dr. Charleston added the idea that they also look at facilities and construction money to enlarge funding for Indian schools. Mr. Lewis agreed that a set-aside for this would be really helpful so that Indian schools are not competing with other schools. Dr. Bell recommended they look at potential set-asides from Bureau of Land Management development of petroleum, coal, timber, and mineral resources. He specifically referenced the Federal Mineral Leasing Act. Dr. Demmert felt that they would need someone from an outside group to do this and asked if anyone could name a likely candidate. Dr. Ginsburg said that ED could pay such a person if the Task Force would name that person. He added that they should know programs and that it might be a perfect assignment for the GWU Policy Center. Dr. Demmert wondered if Alan Parker might be a good person.

Dr. Ginsburg reminded members that in past meetings they had discussed the poor coordination between BIA scholarships and Pell grants. This might be another area to look into to see if it is true. Another area to investigate would be whether or not institutions use one source of financial aid to offset another. Dr. Beaulieu noted that the regulations prohibit institutions from pulling out their own money. Dr. Tippeconnic said they could look into this to see if a problem exists.

Recommendations for State Governments:

1. Provide assistance to public schools serving American Native students designed to develop comprehensive educational plans to improve the academic achievement level of Native students.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested expanding this statement to read "*to meet the educational needs and* to improve the academic achievement level...." He added that the word "designed" was not needed.

Dr. Ginsburg asked if the state was to provide financial assistance, technical assistance, planning assistance, or something else. Dr. Demmert indicated that he had been thinking of financial and technical assistance.

2. Authorize Departments of Education to provide technical assistance to local schools in the areas of incorporating early childhood education principals in the primary grades, developing curriculum that is culturally and linguistically appropriate for all grades, and for inservice training for teachers for the multicultural school and classrooms.

Approved as drafted.

3. Develop legislation that implements Title I of P.L. 101-477, the Active American Languages Act of October 10, 1990, in the public schools of the state.

Approved as drafted.

4. Provide specific funding for Indian children in public schools that encourages schools to develop linguistically, culturally, and developmentally appropriate curriculum in schools that Native children attend.

Mr. Lewis proposed that the statement be expanded to read "appropriate curriculum *and teaching practices...*"

Dr. Demmert suggested amending it further to read "to develop and use...." He then said he was not sure how #2 and #4 differed. A suggestion was made to combine the two by amending #2 to read "to provide technical assistance *and funding.*"

5. Insure equity in funding for school facilities and school operations in all school districts across the respective states.

Dr. Ginsburg cautioned that reference to equity for all schools in a state gets into equalization and shifting funds across district lines. Mr. Tullis added that this issue was causing a virtual "shooting war" in Texas.

After brief discussion, it was decided to leave the statement broadly-based as drafted.

6. Provide legislation that allows tribal language and culture experts to attain certification (in partnership between universities and tribes) as classroom teachers once their competence as teachers has been documented.

Approved as drafted.

Other Recommendations for States:

Dr. Beaulieu proposed a recommendation regarding funding equity for tribal schools. He noted that states can contribute here, as is done in Minnesota, without interfering with tribal authority. He also suggested that although funding of tribal schools is predominantly a federal issue there is some language in "Time for Change" that could be used to address the issue of state support. Dr. Demmert agreed that Dr. Beaulieu should draft something to cover this idea.

Mr. Ely warned that states will already be very sensitive to this entire set of recommendations and something like that would really set them off.

Mr. Hamley wondered about a recommendation that would address the multicultural education problem and cover the accuracy of how Natives are portrayed in curriculum development.

Dr. Demmert suggested they accomplish this by adding a phrase like "*in partnership with Native Americans*" to the recommendation on curriculum development.

Dr. Charleston said that there was a need to clarify the states' responsibility for providing education in those states where a large non-Native population lives within reservation boundaries. Does it fall to the state and public education or to the tribe? Mr. Ely said that they would be walking a tightrope in trying to address this issue.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that there should be a recommendation that states have a multi-year plan to indicate how they will achieve the Native American education goals and that they gather evaluation data every three years to document progress. This could then be linked to waivers for federal requirements.

Ms. King said that sufficient funds are not available to enable SEAs to collect statewide data. Dr. Ginsburg questioned whether the states would need additional money to collect statistics.

Mr. Lewis proposed that there be language to assure the ability of a tribe to influence and prioritized the use of 874 set-aside money so that it funds community-based projects rather than just those that are school-based. He offered to draft language to cover this.

Recommendations for Local Governments

1. Provide voting and other political considerations that allow Native residents of their communities to be elected to school boards.

Mr. Ely asked if there were anyplace where this was not already allowed. Dr. Demmert said that although it is allowed, districting can enhance or limit severely Native American access to school board positions. Mr. Ely then felt that the statement should be more specific.

Mr. Lewis said that in Gallup, NM, they are trying to redistrict from an "at-large" basis which would result in a loss of the Navajo board member. Mr. Fullerton advised that the statement be left open or it would become politically unacceptable. Members agreed that it should not be changed.

2. Insure that school budgets address the needs of the multicultural citizens served by the local schools.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that it read "the needs of *culturally unique* citizens..." Dr. Demmert said he had a broader scope in mind so that virtually every community would have multicultural offerings. Dr. Beaulieu proposed saying "address the *multicultural needs* of citizens...."

Dr. Ginsburg suggested they have a recommendation on development of local plans that would parallel the state plans. Dr. Demmert said that this was included under the federal recommendations.

Dr. Ginsburg then asked about covering Dr. Bell's notion of parent contracts. Dr. Demmert said that would be worked out in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Ely volunteered to draft a section on recommendations for tribal governments and communities. Dr. Beaulieu will draft statements on equitable funding for tribal schools and Mr. Lewis will draft language to cover Impact Aid set-asides.

Mr. Martin raised the issue of hiring a technical writer to polish the final report. Dr. Demmert said that the consensus was in favor of this strategy, so the Task Force should do this. Mr. Fullerton reiterated the understanding that such a writer would be working closely with the INAR staff and co-chairs.

Dr. Charleston indicated that some language for additional recommendations could be found in the "Time for Change" document.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Thursday, February 14, 1991 - Morning Session

Dr. Demmert called the meeting to order at 8:10 am, saying that there were six important things to cover:

1. Review newly drafted language making recommendations for "Tribes and Communities."
2. Review the section entitled "What Do Indian and Alaska Native Parents Want their Children to Become?"
3. Review the section entitled "What Are the Educational, Cultural, Social, Health, and Spiritual Problems Encountered by Students?"
4. Review the section entitled "What Does the Research Say About Improving Schools and Schooling?"
5. Review the overall content and continuity of Dr. Demmert's version of the final report draft.
6. Discuss strategies for implementation.

Mr. Ely began by sharing his draft of language for tribal and community responsibilities, after which members discussed each statement in order:

The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force Recommends that Tribal Governments and Communities:

1. Adopt a tribal specific education code defining the overall goals and strategies of tribal education both on an individual and collective basis.

Mr. Lewis noted that some consulting companies have a canned idea of what codes should be. To avoid setting up the temptation to use such "codes," this may need language about community-based processes leading to the development of codes so they will be more truly responsive to the community they will serve.

Dr. Beaulieu said that two tribes in Minnesota are developing education codes and it is more than just a matter of establishing codes. They are going into the regulatory context within which the schools operate, determining such matters as length of the school year, school schedules and curriculum content. Dr. Demmert felt this might create conflicts with the role of school boards, especially when public schools operate on reservations. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that when there are codes the school board must abide, but without them, the tribes feel they don't have to take responsibility, for instance, in matters of truancy. Mr. Ely said that originally he had used the word "plan" instead of "code" to imply that the tribe would sit down and discuss more than truancy--that they would need to define their ultimate objectives. With this you can go off reservation and say to public schools, "This is what we want for our children!"

Mr. Lewis reiterated the need for this to be accomplished by a community-based process so that it can be legitimate.

2. Appoint education committees to work directly with the local school district or agency in promoting the tribal education code within the system.

Mr. Ely said that the intent of this statement was to mandate by recommendation, that tribes get involved--first, by saying these are the goals of our education system and then by taking these goals to the schools.

Dr. Beaulieu wondered if #1 and #2 could be combined to talk about both development of the code and a mechanism for its implementation in the same statement.

Dr. Demmert suggested this might be a place to tie some education committee members or members of the community to development of the school district and state plans that we have proposed.

3. Encourage education by providing motivation through the prospect of economic opportunity on or near tribal lands.

Mr. Ely stressed his belief that there has to be some motivation for youth employment potentials in their own communities.

Dr. Demmert said he liked this idea of promoting the economy and economic development. We have a way of doing both by focusing on the training of professionals and technicians who are of or from the community, whether they become medical people, researchers, business owners, teachers, administrators or technical specialists. The money they earn can generate a new self-sustaining economic base, whereas now people come in from outside the community and take their earnings away.

Mr. Lewis noted that economic development meshes with the kinds of enterprises you have within your community. In Zuni there are many people who make handcrafted items. Why couldn't education systems help some students develop skills in these arts and also teach them small business development? We need programs that utilize appropriate technology and economic development based on what is already in place.

Mr. Ely suggested it was important to leave the statement vague so that tribes can define it as it applies locally, reflecting local economic development efforts. In Zuni this might lead to an emphasis on crafts, whereas in Paiute areas the emphasis might be on fishing. This statement is saying that tribes have a responsibility to go beyond supporting education.

Although he was not sure how they should be incorporated, Dr. Beaulieu felt that three important ideas had been raised:

a. We need to provide an education that will develop professionals who can fill jobs already available or needed in tribal communities.

b. We need to have education that meets economic development of tribal communities.

c. We are talking about more than just jobs; we are talking about the interaction between education, the economy, and the overall health and well-being of the community.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that a number of tribes have cultural commissions appointed by tribal governments and this is a good idea that could also be incorporated. Mr. Ely agreed, saying that it would help schools if the tribes stated what they wanted taught within the broad areas of technology.

4. To the extent possible, provide both direct and indirect financial support for schools and institutions where tribal members attend.

Dr. Demmert said this might need to be expanded to include "*preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and colleges and universities where Native students* attend." He also said they might want to add "*to students.*"

5. To the extent possible, support through financial aid and other means the higher education of tribal members.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked that they develop language that would stress the predominance of grants and scholarships over loans since so many students are in default.

Dr. Charleston pointed out that the vast majority of Indian students who go through college on loans can't go back to the tribes to work because their debt on graduation is so high that the low salaries would not permit them to pay off their loans, even though some would dearly love to go back to their communities. He proposed that tribes consider a debt forgiveness program where the tribe assumes the debt for those people who opt to come back and work within their own communities.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that there was no payback provision in OIE's program that would encourage people to work for their tribes. The Task Force might want to put something in recommending a similar approach at the federal level.

Mr. Ely said he liked Dr. Charleston's idea but only if loan agencies don't bypass the tribes. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that at Little Big Horn more than 60 percent of their students are unable to get PELL grants because they have defaulted on a loan. So the system of loans is contributing to the non-completion rate.

Mr. Ely said he had no problem telling the federal, state, and local governments exactly what to do, but at the tribal level it must be left up to the tribes, adding that tribes can best assess tribal resources.

Mr. Lewis wondered why tribal loans couldn't be made with a reduction policy similar to the National Student Defense Loans for teachers who worked in schools in low income areas.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the mainstay of Indian higher education is the older female with children. This is an important issue because so many are struggling and locked out. He recommended they incorporate these ideas to be considered in the higher education section. He added that Minnesota has a loan forgiveness program that could be a model. There are also medical school loan forgiveness programs for doctors who are willing to work in rural areas.

Dr. Demmert said he believed that, wherever possible, serious students should be given the opportunity to go to school without worrying about loans and paybacks. He also noted that if we want to increase the number of Indian students in college, federal programs ought to focus on this as a priority and tribes should also do as much as possible to support them. We have heard over and over that when students leave college it is commonly for financial reasons. He did agree with Mr. Ely that they should keep the recommendation general as far as the tribes were concerned in order to allow maximum discretion.

6. Encourage tribal leadership to become involved in local, state, and federal education policy boards.

Mr. Ely said that this recommendation was intended to remove the assumption that tribal leaders do not want to get personally involved in other policy boards. Here we encourage them to send their leaders rather than appointing someone else like the chairperson of the JOM programs.

Dr. Demmert observed that there are two pieces here worth considering:

a. Tribal leaders should actually become involved in working with children as a public service activity. We often say "I'm too busy," but this should be one of our highest priorities. If we don't establish ourselves as role models, others will not see education as important.

b. We should encourage the participation of tribal leaders in development of district and state plans that would be put together as we have recommended under the federal government section.

Mr. Tullis agreed, adding that whenever the county education group formulates a plan, tribal leaders themselves should go, rather than sending a teacher or program director.

All other members agreed that this was a very important issue.

7. Accept final responsibility and accountability for the level of its members' individual and collective education.

Mr. Ely indicated that this statement was a way of saying to tribes that "you can't blame the federal and state government...your people are your people" and that is the bottom line.

Dr. Demmert recommended expanding the statement to read "education *and the support for maintaining and strengthening tribal language and culture.*" Mr. Ely thought a separate statement should be made to cover that concept.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that this separate statement should recommend that "*tribal governments and communities participate in identification and selection of language and cultural leaders from within the tribe to work within the schools at elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.*"

Follow-up on Concerns and Ideas Raised Previously

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy also responded to the Task Force's earlier question about the impact of the federal recommendation on establishing a foundation for tribal community colleges (#9) and whether or not that would duplicate the efforts of the American Indian College Fund (AICF). She believes that it is an important recommendation and would not really duplicate AICF efforts. She asked whether they were implying an "operational" foundation, since the Tribal Community College Fund is operational. She then recommended that it say "*strengthen the foundation program*" since it needs to double in funding. Dr. Demmert asked if she would draft appropriate language. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that we have tended to use "parity with other comparable institutions" as a goal since what is needed is equitable funding.

Dr. Beaulieu indicated that he and Hayes Lewis had discussed language for a recommendation covering use of Impact Aid that might also address the college funding issue:

> *"The Assistant Secretary for American Indian and Alaska Native Education should conduct an investigation of federal Impact Aid and BIA school funding policies and programs to determine if it is possible to develop a flexible and equitable school funding formula for tribally operated schools and colleges that takes into account (1) the transfer of students between public, tribal, and BIA schools after the start of the school year; (2) support for planning and development; and (3) which recognizes the total array of resources that are typically available to state-operated educational institutions."*

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy had proposed another recommendation that would ask the White House to issue an Executive Order similar to the one Reagan issued in support of "Historically Black Colleges," to look at programs that could be used for their support. She added that this had meant a major strengthening of resources for Historically Black Colleges. She said that they had met last week with White House staff to encourage a similar Executive Order for tribal colleges.

Dr. Charleston read an alternate recommendation on equitable funding:

> *That there be funding to strengthen the foundation/endowment programs for the operation and maintenance of tribal community colleges to strengthen them as learning centers for tribes.*

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy noted that tribal colleges have been limited to the status quo and have never had enough money for developing of new colleges, yet there are at least eight tribes that want to have their own programs. In order to make this happen, at least 5 percent of total funding ought to be set aside for planning and development of new colleges. She also said that money needed to be made available for facilities development. She stressed that money was badly needed for renovation and especially new construction.

Dr. Demmert advised that in reality tribal colleges would not see much additional funding until elementary and secondary education is covered. With the current economic situation and the war, access to additional funding is going to be extremely limited.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy then suggested that the notion of equitable funding for tribal colleges be added to the section on elementary and secondary education. She went on to raise another issue of concern to Indian higher education. Apparently many educators in postsecondary institutions are seeing an alarming increase in incidences of racial tension and trouble on campuses. Indians are such a small number on most campuses that colleges say that Indians should only hold .001 percent of the faculty position. In Chico, CA, it is such a problem that students are fasting in protest. Often, the colleges our students attend are in "red-neck" country. These institutions recruit Indian students and then do nothing to support them. I'm not sure what should be said here, but this needs to be addressed.

Dr. Demmert told her that Mr. Hamley had testified yesterday on behalf of students from Stanford and Harvard, sharing their recommendations, and perhaps the concern over racial tension could be added to this section. He went on to say that he had received a call the night before from someone requesting help at one college with a fairly large number of Indian students. This caller had received a healthy research grant in bilingual education and had indicated to the grantors that he would like to hire a Native American staff person to participate. He was told by the federal project officer that they could not hire a Native American because "the institution has no historical record of serving this audience."

Dr. Ginsburg said that this made no sense, and he would check into it at ED.

Dr. Beaulieu offered his version of a statement on equitable funding:

"There should be flexible and equitable funding for all tribally operated schools and colleges. Funding needs to include support for planning and development. Particular attention needs to be paid to the role of federal Impact Aid and BIA funding policies and programs so as to enhance the total array of resources typically available to operate educational institutions."

Dr. Demmert pointed out that we now have several recommendations on equitable funding, one on Impact Aid, two on tribal schools and colleges. Dr. Beaulieu noted that we have a statement on funding equity in "Time for Change," but it is not in the draft we reviewed yesterday. The one on Impact Aid gets at the problem created because funding is based on school counts in the fall. However, there is mobility in the population, and Impact Aid funds don't transfer. Dr. Ginsburg noted that there was a statement covering public schools. Dr. Demmert said that all of these needed to be combined.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that another problem is the lack of respect for family responsibilities of students. Most students have families to support (many have two or more children) and are less likely to be able to make up the difference between expenses and scholarships/grants/loans that are expected as parental contributions. Some institutions only provide support to one student in couples where both are students. Financial Aid officers make these decisions and students don't know about this until they get on campus where they end up suffering. In tribal colleges 75 percent of our students have families.

Dr. Demmert highlighted several problems that still needed to be addressed:

a. agreeing on the detail of the recommendations and whether we focus on broader policy issues;

b. deciding whether or not to rank recommendations as primary and secondary; and

c. deciding whether we need legislative recommendations and separate recommendations for both ED and the BIA.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that we need a quick brief or fact sheet to simplify all of these issues and explain how programs work as higher education is coming up for reauthorization. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that AIHEC was preparing something on this. Dr. Ginsburg asked if the Task Force could get a copy, and she agreed.

Dr. Beaulieu added one more issue for consideration. He felt there was a need to spell out more clearly what was meant by a state plan. One feature needs specific mention--they must enable congruence between all federal efforts that affect Indian students. Dr. Demmert asked if that hadn't been adequately addressed in the section on coordination. Dr. Beaulieu said it also needs to be addressed at the state and local level so that Chapter 1, handicapped education, and all of the other programs are coordinated. Dr. Ginsburg said that when you are talking about granting waivers you go even further because then the plan must take into consideration all federal resources coming into the district in order to qualify.

Content of the Demmert Draft

Dr. Demmert asked for feedback on the Introduction. Dr. Beaulieu said it should be kept but needed to be strengthened so it would highlight the unique status of Indians. Mr. Ely said that it was "too damn boring."

Culture and Academic Concerns

Dr. Beaulieu recommended they talk about the interaction between the cultural theme and loss of language as a continuing issue and also look into the interrelationship of individual, community, and cultural at-risk factors. He said that we should stay away from compartmentalizing these issues and that political legal status needs to be handled in another section.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stressed that this issue cannot be diluted. It needs to be concentrated and up front. She reminded members that there was a section in "Time for Change" where the risks are itemized and asked if this could be lifted and included in the final report.

What are the Educational, Cultural, Social, Health, and Spiritual Problems Encountered by Students?

Dr. Beaulieu said that they should add racism as a problem because it is still a major issue. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that it ranges from insensitivity to racism. We can say: "*Parents and students note attitudes that range from insensitivity to outright racism.*" Dr. Charleston noted that we also have "sheer ignorance" as a contributing factor. Dr. Beaulieu said that this had great impact on the curriculum, the way schools operate, and the way students are treated.

On the funding issue Ms. Pease-Windy Boy expressed hope that graphs illustrating the decline in real dollars could be included because they are shocking. If we could compare other data from the Kennedy Report with current statistics, this would be helpful and have an impact. Dr. Demmert said that the actual amount of money allocated to Indian education has increased substantially. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy advocated using a consistent time frame (dating from the Kennedy Report) to analyze all of these data. This will become a critical part of our story, that in over 30 years there has been no real improvement, and in fact there has been erosion. The shock factor can be heightened by showing the lack of contrast.

Dr. Beaulieu said that the report needs to have a clear sense of the problem. With declining real dollars and an increasing population (especially among its poorest members), the needs are continuing and expanding. If we can show a criss-crossing of the increased demand and the shrinking ability to meet the demand, it will convey our sense of urgency. This is true in almost every area of our concern. For instance, our efforts over the past 20 years are generating an increased interest in higher education at a time when our resources to help students have seriously declined.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that they also stress the youthfulness of our population, noting that even Indians do not fully understand this. If we can get past the misconception that Indians are dead and gone, we will have accomplished a great deal.

Dr. Demmert reviewed some of the major changes that had taken place in Indian education since the passage of Title IV, saying that we now have:

(1) tribal community colleges

(2) a significantly larger number of students in college

(3) a much larger number of Indian college graduates

(4) a significant increase in the number of teachers and Indians in other professions, (in fact Title IV has directly provided jobs for those graduates out there who couldn't find jobs elsewhere)

(5) improved physical health

(6) significant increases in parental involvement in education

(7) increased number of contract schools

We have been successful and this has increased the demand, but at the same time we have far fewer resources. The sense of urgency is heightened as we face future failures which could come simply from our success and the burden of demographics.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy suggested that we use illustrations to show how things have evolved from decade to decade in our search for equity. Many things were achieved in the 1970s and then we reached the 1980s and stalled. A decade-by-decade comparison could show where we might have been if our successes had continued on the same trajectory. What would our data look like if we had achieved equity with whites? Their college graduation rate is 26 percent while ours is only 6 percent. What basis of understanding do we present? Our strongest comparison is with white people.

Dr. Demmert wondered where would be the most appropriate place to include this kind of illustration of progress/lack of progress. Should it go in the papers, or in the report, given that we can't include too much in the report?

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy argued that without using quantitative data in the final report a compelling argument cannot really be made. It is very important to say how "unstable," and how "unequal" the state of Indian education is. Otherwise we will get pity but no support.

Dr. Ginsburg agreed that it would be a good idea to include some comparative charts in the final report.

Dr. Beaulieu pointed out that Indians have only recently been involved in public education. Until the 1920s, 70 percent of the Chippewa weren't even in school, so it has really only been one generation.

What Do American Indian and Alaska Native Parents Want Their Children to Become?

Dr. Demmert asked if this section was needed, and, if so, what might need to be added.

Mr. Tullis said that it was needed as an explanation of our ultimate goals. Dr. Beaulieu agreed, saying that these were things we had all heard at the hearings. Dr. Demmert suggested that perhaps we should review the hearings to see what might be missing. Dr. Tippeconnic felt that this section was particularly important for our non-Native audience.

Dr. Charleston asked if this section was separate from or similar to the "Guiding Principles." Dr. Demmert said that the "Guiding Principles" provided a framework from which to go forward, but that he was not sure they were needed in the report.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if there were a way to affirm the process we have been through to reach these ideas. We have been all over the country and have heard from so many parents, students, and educators--some of whom came many miles to testify. She said she would like to see the report capture the sense of how many parents we heard from and actually affirm what was said, rather than what we think they want.

Dr. Beaulieu confirmed Ms. Pease-Windy Boy's notion, saying that never before had there been such a strong voice trying to explain what the problems and issues are. The hearing process was extremely powerful, because we heard from people coming from all over the country to share their views and try to articulate the problems.

Dr. Demmert said that this raises the issue of how to deal with the Supplemental Papers. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy wondered if we could include quotes in the final report to embody this process, allowing parents to have an actual voice here. We could either get permission to quote parents by name or we could quote them by role and region. Dr. Demmert agreed that we needed to capture this, saying that if the report can embody this incredible sense of people bringing things forward, it would be pitiful to have such an overwhelming national expression of need and then see it turned down.

Dr. Charleston expressed interest in Task Force plans for the Commissioned Papers. He noted that the authors had each received a huge pile of documents on the hearings so that they could be used in their papers.

Dr. Beaulieu said that some were excellent in their use of quotes from the hearings and others were weak. Leaving the papers aside, he said that we really needed to focus on the "voice of the people" in the final report. If we had another paper that just examined the question "what is the voice of the American Indian?"--then the final report could flow from this. Dr. Charleston and Ms. Pease-Windy Boy pointed out that Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Volume already does this in the last section--Summary of the Hearings.

Ms. Pease Windy-Boy said that she would advise just going back to the testimony to get quotes, especially from parents. She noted that use of quotes would lift the piece from the style of the report. It would be extremely powerful and it would be an important "first," signifying to people who testified that they really were heard.

Dr. Demmert said he liked the idea of using actual parental quotes to express their desires for their children. Dr. Beaulieu asked if there could be a section of the report dedicated to the "voice of the people," using Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Volume. Dr. Demmert said that it could be used as an appendix to the report rather than with the papers.

Dr. Charleston returned to his concern about the Commissioned Papers noting that originally the Task Force had said that they would be submitted to ERIC. He said that he had assembled them in a draft as a Supplemental Volume with the Task Force's intent that people in Indian country could use them to find strategies, solutions, and details for their own work. It includes 22 chapters and is an incredible resource, citing the most modern and up-to-date thinking on Indian education. He also advised that the first drafts that had been sent out were preliminary and that authors had had only limited time to get those in. He said that they would see remarkable changes in the more recent volume; he expected even more improvements in the final version that would be available after the February due date.

Mr. Ely raised his concern about including a section on strategies for implementation. He suggested that when the report is finalized in May, the Task Force should stay together until we produce at least an outline to determine strategies and implementation guidelines. He believes that the Task Force owes this to the people who have participated in the process to at least spend one full session on this issue, which ought to include bringing in outside advisors on lobbying, influencing Congress, and dealing with state and local school districts.

Dr. Demmert argued that we didn't really need to bring people in to tell us how to do these things, rather we need to engage people in helping us to do it.

1. We must concentrate on enlisting the support of key people in Congress (Senator Inouye, Representative Ford in the House, and staff people like Bob Arnold and Alan Lovesee).

2. We need to work with the new Secretary of Education on those things that ED will agree to focus on.

3. We need to tie into the White House Conference. John Tippeconnic is the ED liaison who will help with this.

4. We must encourage communities, tribes and professional organizations to agitate for implementing the recommendations of the report.

5. We should meet with the Chief State School Officers to talk about how they can help us.

6. We should work through the Indian Policy Center and Alan Parker.

7. We need to identify and work with all other professional organizations (e.g., the National Association of Science Teachers) that can influence districts by encouraging their members to push for implementation of the recommendations.

If we support the states in a serious way, we can make a lot of progress. The local schools would be the focus of activities for the tribes, communities, and associations.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that parents would never use ERIC and that few practitioners actually use it. She worries that so many need the information in the Supplemental Volume and that it really needs to be available to people out in the communities. Dr. Beaulieu agreed that these papers should be published and available as a printed volume as well as in ERIC. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that the Task Force's credibility in the Indian community would go sky-high if we could do both.

What are the Educational, Cultural, Social, Health, and Spiritual Problems Encountered by Students?

Dr. Demmert said that there was no need to go through these problems unless members had things they wanted to add. He added that there was no need to review the section on "**What Schools Can Do....**" since that had been discussed under recommendations. He suggested that they might use another resource for reviewing the section on "**What Does the Research Say About Improving Schools and Schooling?**" He then proposed they talk about the process for finishing the final report over the next couple of months, offering his ideas for procedures:

1. Re-work his draft to incorporate ideas that have been presented at the Palo Alto meeting.

Mr. Tullis said he hoped that the summary would not be changed much because it does an outstanding job of capturing what has been said and is phrased in a way that will be understood by many in Indian country.

2. Find a writer to help jazz-up the piece. (Dr. Demmert noted that he had several candidates in mind.)

3. Decide what pieces in "Time for Change" should be lifted and added to the Demmert draft, including important charts and tables.

Dr. Charleston referred to Ms. Pease-Windy Boy's idea of developing charts that would compare data over the decades.

4. Decide what additional sections need to be drafted. This can be discussed later.

5. Develop a way to accommodate the concept of "voices of the people." This could be done by pulling out the larger piece in the Supplementary Volume--Chapter 2 and editing it.

Dr. Charleston said that since this was a summary of what had been said rather than direct quotes, it really won't accomplish the purpose intended. To identify individuals as speakers we would need to go back to the testimony.

Dr. Demmert asked if we really wanted to name speakers. Dr. Ginsburg suggested they could cite the type of speaker (e.g., parent, teacher, student...,) and the regional hearing. Dr. Charleston agreed that this would be important and a good strategy. Dr. Demmert asked who could go back through the testimony to pull out the quotes, suggesting that Policy Studies Associates might do this. Dr. Charleston said that another way to find the quotes would be to go to the commissioned papers, since they were topical and would include quotes and citations from the testimony. Dr. Beaulieu noted that the San Diego hearings were also organized by topic, adding that the summaries the Task Force had received from each of the hearings were very powerful and that same sense needed to be captured in the final report.

Dr. Tippeconnic voiced his concern that the Introduction still needed a theme or a headline to get people's attention. We could use "A Time for Change" or the concept of "Survival" or we could go back to the testimony to look for a strong theme. Dr. Demmert proposed "*Indian Nations At Risk - Voice of the People,*" saying that we have never had this kind of report before. Dr. Charleston agreed that there was a need for a theme, and that the Task Force really needed to decide what the focus of the report should be before it is rewritten.

Dr. Demmert said his sense was that the focus should be on the improvement of schools and academic performance, but that would not do for a title. He also liked the theme of the importance of retaining the Native language and cultural base for Indian communities.

Dr. Beaulieu proposed they try to capture the criss-crossing concept he had discussed earlier. People are telling their story and expressing their views to schools--building on the voice of the people theme--but the tragedy is that people aren't listening.

Dr. Tippeconnic asked who would be the audience for the final report.

Dr. Demmert noted that ED was funding the effort, so they are the first audience. Then we have the Indian community, professional educators who serve Indian students, the White House Conference, Congress, state legislators, politicians generally, and so on. In other words, a very broad audience. But the focus would be ED with the others as secondary.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that, in other words, the audience was the whole country and also individuals so that in reality every person has a responsibility to Indians and Indian education.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that the report has to capture the attention of Indian people. As long as it is loyal to the hearings and what the people have said, it will do this very well. They will agree with the recommendations, seeing it as their own report, and they will carry it forward. It must be a document that says "we have listened and are trying to reflect what has been said." In that sense this report is a vehicle for Indian communities and people to communicate their concerns to a broader audience.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that on the cover in bold type should be the words "*American Indian and Alaska Natives*" so it will be very clear who this is about.

Dr. Demmert proposed that "*Indian Nations At Risk*" would be a good theme, and that the title might read "*Voice of THE PEOPLE.*" Dr. Charleston said that when he speaks for "The People" it is an extremely serious and important matter in his culture. It makes him a little nervous to use that phrase...we would have to be extremely careful.

Dr. Beaulieu said that the Task Force should have a number of alternatives presented so they can select the best one. Dr. Ginsburg suggested staff come up with a list of the top ten ideas and circulate this for feedback.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested they call the appendix "*Voice of the People*" and have a broader title for the report, possibly "*Indian Nations at Risk - A Time for Change.*" Mr. Tullis said he liked that idea because he personally feels that Indian nations are "at risk" and education is one of the main problems. Schools are one more thing that have been taken away from Natives. Dr. Demmert pointed out that they would have a problem with the Inuit and Aleuts using this title. It would be better if it read "*Nations At Risk - American Indians and Alaska Natives.*"

Dr. Tippeconnic shared his concern that the title also be phrased to have an impact on the non-Indian audience who has very limited knowledge of the issue.

Additional Recommendations submitted by Task Force Members:

Parental, Community and Tribal Involvement (Hayes Lewis)

Every agency responsible for educating Indian children will provide opportunities for Indian parents, communities, and tribes to assist in planning and evaluating the governance, operation, and performance of schools serving Indian children.

Tribal Governments (Ms. Pease-Windy Boy):

Tribal governments advocate for increased grant support for higher education from the BIA or other agencies.

Tribal governments assist schools to identify cultural expertise for involvement with schools.

The Renewal/Restructuring of Educational Systems serving Indian Tribes and Native Communities (Hayes Lewis)

Schools and systems serving Indian and Native Alaskan populations use the best information and resources available to work with parents, and tribal and community leaders in reforming and restructuring the educational systems, policies, services, and practices to design more effective strategies to meet the academic, cultural, and educational needs of children and tribal communities.

Funding for above:

In order to achieve the national goals as well as INAR educational goals, the United States Government must commit the required financial resources necessary to bring about needed educational reforms in the public/tribal and Bureau of Indian Affairs systems.

To the White House (Ms. Pease-Windy Boy)

Initiate an Executive Order approach to strengthening tribal colleges in a pattern like the 1981 U.S. President's Executive Order assisting Historically Black Colleges.

Department of Education

Emphasize and support grants and scholarships as financial aid to American Indian higher education students, diminishing the loan support.

Recommendation for Postsecondary - Education

The financial support of Native students should be predominately grants, scholarships and fellowships and limited reliance on loans. Financial aid needs to be sensitive to family responsibilities of students and provide support to cover family obligations.

These recommendations were submitted in writing but were not discussed.

Dr. Demmert adjourned the meeting at 10:15 am.

Appendix A

Indian Nations at Risk
Task Force Meeting
February 12, 1991

Summary of Recommendations for Final Report:

- Parent participation and involvement
- Culturally based curriculum - curriculum that uses the culture
- Need for adequate funding
- Teachers need to be trained to incorporate culture into their teaching
- Preschool and daycare, including health and nutritional needs
- Personal and tribal responsibility, including setting standards, funding, social guidance, and governance
- Definition of practical need for education, that the end result be a positive contribution to society
- Need for adult basic education to pick up those who have been missed by existing schools
- Emphasis on what the American society will lose if we stay on the current course
- Benefits for American society if we make significant changes
- Talk honestly about what we mean by "Indian Nations At Risk" in terms of individuals, families, communities, tribes, and cultures - what are the critical issues
- A vision that leaps above our parochial vantage points and allows us to take a leadership role
- Explain why our best ideas and creativity are isolated and their ultimate success is threatened
- In defining the problem, we need to acknowledge that the vast majority of students are being served by public schools
- Recognize that there is a problem with the definition of who is Indian - Ensure that all identified students are served
- We need to compel or cajole states, through a federal presence, to do a better job of educating Indian students and recognizing their unique status - comparable to guarantees for handicapped students
- Portray the basic funding issue in terms of the graphs on pages 18 and 19 in the draft "A Treaty for 1992" and recommend a large increase in appropriations for Indian students in early childhood through college
- Emphasize high level of literacy as a goal, both in English and in tribal languages

- Emphasize other academic proficiencies in the areas of math, science, and social studies
- Emphasize motivation of students to want to learn by offering rewards and incentives where they don't exist
- Provide access to higher education and access to financial aid
- Pursue set-asides in other federal appropriations such as Chapter 1

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

Fifth and Final Business Meeting: June 10 - 11, 1991

Washington, DC

The fifth meeting of the Indian Nations At Risk (INAR) Task Force was held in the Barnard Auditorium at the U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC. Task Force members present included Co-chair William Demmert, David Beaulieu, Joseph Ely, Byron Fullerton, Norbert Hill, Hayes Lewis, Bob Martin, Janine Pease-Windy Boy, Eddie Tullis, and Lamar White. Task Force members not in attendance included Co-chair Terrell Bell, Wilma Robinson, Ivan Sidney, and Robert Swan. Staff members present included Executive Director Alan Ginsburg, Project Director Mike Charleston, and Deputy Director Gaye Leia King. Others in attendance included John Tippeconnic, Director, Office of Indian Education, (OESE), U.S. Department of Education; Barbara Creel, Legislative Policy Analyst, National Advisory Council of Indian Education (NACIE); John Cheek, Office Manager, NACIE; Beth Fine, Program Officer of Library Programs, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education; Ernabelle Skye, Staff Assistant, Office of Indian Education Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); Kelcey Klass, Program Analyst, Budget Service (OPBE), U.S. Department of Education; Nancy Loy, Program Analyst, Planning and Evaluation Service, (OPBE), U.S. Department of Education; and Gina Willis, White House Liaison, Office of Policy Development.

Monday, June 10, 1991 - Morning Session

At 9:00 am, Dr. Demmert called the meeting to order. He welcomed Task Force members to Washington, DC, and asked that the record indicate the names of the Task Force members present. As you all know, we are going to wrap up differences in the report today or tomorrow. Hopefully we will be able to do that quickly. We will open up discussion in a minute.

Dr. Demmert asked the members of the audience to introduce themselves, as recorded above, and then asked for general comments from Task Force members.

Mr. Hill said that during a teleconference held on May 10, 1991 at 3:30 pm, the Task Force decided to hold its fifth meeting in either Denver or Salt Lake City. I am concerned about the self-determination of the Task Force. Dr. Demmert replied that during the teleconference he said he would talk to the Department and, as it turned out, holding the meeting in Washington, DC seemed the easiest. I did not take a poll of Task Force members because I thought it would be okay. Furthermore, if we make changes in the report, we can do that immediately and not have to send it in (to Washington). That way we can see the changes right then and there.

Mr. Lewis said that he did not participate in the teleconference and he appreciates the opportunity to have another chance to look at the report. I think there are things to look at in the report, and we can do that here.

Dr. Demmert asked for any thoughts on the content of the report. We will save the recommendations for the last part of the discussion. We will go through them one at a time to decide if we should keep, eliminate, or change any of them. Are there any general recommendations for the report?

Dr. Beaulieu asked if they should list their recommendations. Dr. Demmert said they could go to specific pages to determine if the Task Force generally agrees or disagrees with any comments made during their discussion. In comments I have already received, no one has suggested any major changes.

Mr. Hill questioned where the Bill of Rights was in the report. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy pointed out that it was part of the introduction.

Dr. Demmert asked Buck Martin from the White House Conference to join the Task Force at the front table.

Mr. Lewis questioned how the graphs will be tied into the text of the report. They are important, but in the current draft they are disjointed and interspersed on every other page. Just when the reader gets into the text, it bounces over to a graph. This breaks one's train of thought.

Dr. Demmert said there were three questions on graphs: (1) location, (2) relation to content (they ought to be in direct relation to the content), and (3) source. For those taken from the NACIE report, we ought to go to the original source, if it is available. If the original source is not available, we need to make sure the information is accurate.

Dr. Charleston explained that there are two sides to the report. The left side contains supplemental information such as graphs and descriptions of exemplary programs. Because there is such a high volume of supplementary information, if we try to disperse it throughout the text, it will make the text insignificant. It will be hard to locate the text amid the graphs. This is why we condensed it. We were thinking of printing the supplemental material in a different color. Maybe we need to question how much of that material we really want in the report. We relied partly on material coming out of ED, and the best collection of information is from NACIE. Several times we checked the accuracy of the information and it is as accurate as we have.

Bob Martin said that as an example, to look at text on page 25 that cites figures for the federal funding coming from the BIA. The graph on page 34 also talks about federal funding. I think this information is very significant and those two pieces of information should be in close proximity to each other. Also, when we talk about funding we should consider the past 10 to 15 years. Dr. Demmert agreed that Bob Martin made an important point.

Mr. Hill said that he liked the graphs and thought they should be included in the report. I am glad to see math and science mentioned. Also, maybe having different shading is a good idea.

Dr. Demmert explained that Dr. Charleston had not yet looked at this with a designer. Dr. Ginsburg noted that there was money available in the budget for a professional designer, but they should first agree on the content. He noted that they would also use a professional editor to make sure the report reads well.

Dr. Demmert said that as they sit down with a professional designer they will keep the Task Force's suggestions in mind. Today we will look to see which charts need to be more closely tied to the narrative, so pay attention as we go through the report and point out any charts that need to better correspond to the text.

Mr. Ely commented that he thought Dr. Charleston's idea of setting the charts to the side was a good one.

Dr. Demmert called for more suggestions from the Task Force. Mr. Ely said that if the decision was up to him about which charts to eliminate, they would end up with only 10 percent of what is currently included. Dr. Beaulieu suggested that they wait until they agree on the content before deciding which charts to include. Dr. Demmert said that they will focus on the narrative and general content and will look at the graphs as a secondary issue as it arises during their discussion. Mr. Hill commented that the report would be incomplete without the graphs.

Mr. Hill pointed out that Chart 2 indicates one figure for the number of students enrolled in BIA schools and page 11 indicates a different figure. What are we counting on page 11? This needs to be clarified. Dr. Demmert pointed out that Chart 2 was an older chart, and the figure cited on Page 11 came from more recent census data. Mr. Hill said that this needs to be cleaned up. Dr. Charleston said that the data on page 11 come from the current 1990 census data, but the census bureau does not yet have the age breakdown complete. We do not have accurate data from the census, so Chart 2 is the best we have.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Tippeconnic how many students were funded through Title V. Dr. Tippeconnic responded that there were 300,000. Dr. Demmert questioned whether there were some students not funded because the schools did not apply for funds. Dr. Tippeconnic replied that yes, some students were not funded, but those are mainly from the smaller schools. Dr. Demmert then questioned how many students were funded through the BIA. Ernabelle Skye reported that there were 40,000. Dr. Demmert said that therefore they were talking about 340,000 elementary and secondary students. Mr. Fullerton noted that the number of students in BIA schools cited on page 11 was not accurate. Dr. Tippeconnic said that of the 40,000 students funded through the BIA, ED's Office of Indian Education funds about 80 percent with Title V.

Dr. Demmert said that their problem is that they are unable to obtain a figure for preschool and college students. Dr. Beaulieu suggested that they could estimate a number. Dr. Demmert said that the BIA has an estimate of the backlog. We need to focus on elementary and secondary students and leave the other categories of students out, or we need to find good numbers for postsecondary students.

Dr. Charleston said he has a chart that was left out of the report that shows postsecondary enrollment. That chart shows that 20 percent of Native students are in school, including postsecondary education. We can also show that money coming from the BIA and public schools has shifted downward if we consider the full age range. The purpose is to show differences in public school enrollment over time.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Charleston what 20 percent he was referring to. Dr. Charleston said that there was a significant number of Natives in postsecondary education. If we put in the total number of Natives in school, it brings the number of total enrollment up to 20 percent.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said it would be effective to show the number of school-age children who drop out, although we might not have a source for that information. Dr. Ginsburg asked the Task Force to look at page 10 and noted that the percentage of dropouts would look relatively small even though we know there are a large number of dropouts. Our figure would be deceptively low.

Dr. Demmert noted that when you consider the ninth through twelfth grades, the percentage of dropouts climbs up to 60 percent; it is not 35 percent per year. Dr. Ginsburg said that this should be rephrased. The graph in the report comes from a sample of tenth grade students who were followed over time to see who graduated. Dr. Demmert said that if the percentage is derived from a three year period, it is lower than he imagined. Dr. Ginsburg noted that there are also students who drop out before the tenth grade.

Dr. Beaulieu asked what the source of this information was. Dr. Ginsburg replied that it came from the "High School and Beyond" study. Dr. Beaulieu noted that a study in Minneapolis followed students from the ninth grade, and not a single Indian student graduated. Dr. Demmert noted that this happens in large city districts. Mr. Tullis said that they tracked students from the ninth grade to graduation and were down to 10 or 11 percent. Dr. Beaulieu noted that over a seven year period, in all of the schools in Minnesota, the statewide graduation rate was only 45 percent.

Dr. Demmert said that we know the problems but we do not have the information we need. We have to use the best information that we have. He asked Dr. Charleston to look at the figures and make adjustments on those that they use. We can include college students and a narrative about that, or just use elementary and secondary school students. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that we need two different statements on this topic because the age range of people in college is so large. Dr. Ginsburg noted that page 28 mentions postsecondary enrollment.

Dr. Tippeconnic noted that adult education and literacy were also missing. There are two goals that consider adult education but there is no mention of it in the text. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy pointed out that there were no data available. Dr. Tippeconnic suggested that consequently they should say something about the lack of data. Dr. Demmert agreed that the inclusion of adult education was important because adult illiteracy is high in some states.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested lining up the various enrollment figures to show the pathway of students. So many students drop out of high school but then go on to adult education. There are many different pathways, and many people do not take the diploma route.

Dr. Demmert said that there were two things to keep in mind. We need to provide accurate data for the content of the report. We also need to show the relationship of that data to the text. Dr. Charleston and I will look at the report and see how to incorporate the data. For our discussion, please identify specific recommendations if you have any to make sure the charts are appropriate and suggest continuity.

Mr. Lewis referred the Task Force to the section on recommendations and questioned who was accountable for changing the system. I think we are giving mixed messages. Pages 59 and 63 allude to parents as partners. A bullet on page 59 indicates that tribes have responsibility. Page 63 gives this responsibility to principals. Page 63 reads, "Give authority and responsibility for improving schools directly to the principals." We could broaden this and say "principals need to facilitate the process of teachers, administrators, parents, and the tribal community." We could also see how this ties in to the national efforts for improving the educational process. That would tie into other parts of the report.

Dr. Demmert questioned how they would respond to partnerships and the need for leadership. Dr. Beaulieu suggested changing the word "responsibility" to "leadership." Buck Martin said that we know the principal is responsible in the school setting and the tribe is responsible on a broader level. Mr. Lewis warned that there would be literal readers.

Dr. White said that Florida has school improvement plans that involve the parents but the principal is the leader. This process involves shared decisionmaking, which is a national movement.

Dr. Demmert asked Mr. Lewis to think up specific language for this point and suggested the Task Force return to content.

Mr. Ely warned that it is important they do not make their statement so convoluted that it dispels responsibility. Having separate headings for parents, tribal leaders, etc. implies accepting responsibility along with the responsibility of others. We do not want to make this so convoluted that we lose all responsibility. In other words, I like it as it is. Dr. Demmert mentioned that Mr. Lewis should consult with Mr. Ely so that they do not lose the concept of responsibility.

Dr. Demmert said that the paper does show the importance of partnerships. Mr. Lewis said that if we look to the hearings, we can see that one problem is some people do not even get into the school door. If we do not lay out specific responsibilities there may not be the understanding that all of the people in the process have a responsibility. It is easy to break this down by responsibility, but in practicality as it exists today the desired impact does not happen.

Dr. Beaulieu said that the report seemed to be lacking a definition of the problem. We need to define the issue of parent involvement and the issue of restructuring and how it all fits together. We must look at instructional leadership, parent involvement, and tribal government together. I am most concerned that we show how things bind together.

> When looking at page 21, if you try to follow the logic of the report you see that the transition is missing. It moves from the current situation and the current problems directly to the progress we are making. However, we never define why we have problems.
>
> I do not think the second paragraph on page 21 is correct. In Palo Alto we talked about the differences between now and 20 years ago. There is unprecedented involvement in federal grant programs. For example, there are 28 tribal colleges and there are exemplary programs for Indian students. Yet, we have not been able to make a difference. What are the big bricks in the wall that are stopping us? We need to define those bricks.
>
> I think the bricks are the institutions of schools themselves. If we continue to fund schools that are not responsive to the needs of Indians students, we will not be able to go forward. However, if we add this to the middle of the report, it will tie in to our recommendations. It will allow us to take the idea of "Nations at Risk," talk about what we are doing, and make recommendations. That is my main topic for this meeting.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Beaulieu to think about specific recommendations. Think about governance, climate, quality, and attitudes of instructors and the impact of these factors on why we succeed or fail. We do have some successes, but we also have failures. Dr. Beaulieu said that he does evaluations of BIA schools and is amazed to see the diversity of schools within the BIA system. Some are excellent; others are really struggling.

Buck Martin said that these comments make him recall what he heard the previous weekend in Albuquerque. That was the first time I heard anyone say that the programs we call exemplary are really only good. There is nothing wrong with being good, but we are elevating good to exemplary. Consequently, because we say exemplary and really only have a good program, we are lowering our expectations.

Mr. Tullis said that people can be cynical. Because you, Dr. Beaulieu, are working with the BIA you claim they have good schools; however, others say there are no good BIA schools.

Dr. Beaulieu said that they have an active board with strong parent involvement. We can find that in places. All of the points we have mentioned are markers of a good school. Dr. Demmert said that Dr. Beaulieu's piece may fit into the report where we present a general sense of what the research says.

Dr. Tippeconnic questioned whether the audience was the Indian community or a broader audience. I would like to think this is a report to the nation and takes into account parents of all students. Parents have the responsibility to educate their children and other children. There should be a message to all parents and all schools, otherwise they will think our report is a message coming back to only us. Other communities will say our report is not written for them. Maybe what Dr. Beaulieu thinks is missing is what I also think is missing.

Mr. Hill said that some reports cut deals and when people read the report, they ask, "so what?" As we move into Columbus Day 1992, I envision the Indians running out to the boats presenting gifts. If they knew what was to happen, they would not have run to greet the boats. We need to think about what is happening overall.

> Getting back to the content, on page 44 we talk about Harvard and Penn State as exemplary programs. However, because their programs run on soft dollars, I do not think they are committed to Native Americans. Of course Indian people graduate from their programs, but it is not because the

universities put in hard dollars--they just may be good at fundraising. I have problems highlighting them. Furthermore, the dean at Harvard is in trouble because of money problems.

Dr. Demmert said there were two issues at hand. One, what is the commitment of these institutions to Native Americans? Some have little or no commitment, others are strongly committed. Another perspective questions whether or not these programs are working. Penn State's and Harvard's programs are working because there are now Indian people out working. I am talking about the product of people who are now out in the field.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that issues being discussed were not getting resolved. We have not put closure on Mr. Lewis' suggestions nor put closure on what Dr. Beaulieu said about the charts. We need to get back to those issues. Will we be going back to those comments? It occurs to me that other Task Force members have reflections and if we do not have an open discussion we will lose something important.

Dr. Demmert said that they would have an open discussion. The Task Force has passed the time for a philosophical discussion. Now is the time to talk about what is in the report and what needs to be changed. If changes relate to philosophy, that is okay, but discuss philosophy only as it relates to changes in the report.

Mr. Hill said that now they were tinkering with rhetoric. We must have had someone from Minnesota write the report because Dr. Beaulieu appears on pages 48, 50, and 64. But David, you said there were no graduates, so I would like to know why Minnesota is mentioned as exemplary. Isn't anything happening in other parts of the country?

Dr. Demmert said that this was a good point. We need to see if some things are overemphasized. Are there any specific suggestions? There are 14 or 15 pieces on exemplary programs that represent a cross-section of areas. There are at least three representing Minnesota, but this is viable because Minnesota does play a leadership role and is at the front end of educational change.

At 10:00 am, Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Monday, June 10, 1991 - Morning Session Continued

Dr. Demmert asked Beth Fine, Program Officer of Library Programs, OERI, to join the Task Force at the front table.

Ms. Fine began by reading a statement to provide the basis for her perspective. I thank the Task Force for this opportunity to speak to you. We are impressed by what we have read. As William Demmert said, I am looking at this report from the perspective of tribal libraries. Tribal community libraries are essential partners of learning because they serve the cultural and academic needs of all people. I share John Tippeconnic's comment about not finding the word "literacy" in the report and I have about 12 inserts to recommend.

On page nine, second paragraph, I think you should add the word "preservation" so the sentence reads, "American Indians and Alaska Natives must determine the school's role in promoting and preserving historical languages and cultures, the school's educational priorities, and Natives must make a clear statement about what they expect of their youth."

Dr. Demmert explained that this concept was not included because cultures are not static. We use the word "promote" to show the importance of the general concept whether the culture changes or not.

Ms. Fine suggested adding the following bullet on page 17 as one of the problems encountered by Native children: "Limited access to community library resources that answer cultural and academic needs."

Mr. Ely asked Ms. Fine to explain what she meant. She replied that children cannot learn without access to information. Librarians are educators also. There must be a place where people can find information so they can pursue whatever they want. Mr. Ely asked if the problem was a lack of libraries, or a lack of materials and information. Ms. Fine replied that both were missing. There is a lack of materials and a lack of information. How can we find information if there is no access to that information? Mr. Ely said that there are libraries in his area, but there is no access to materials on their Native culture because materials do not exist.

Dr. Demmert asked if this bullet should be included and the general response was for its inclusion.

Dr. White questioned whether Ms. Fine preferred the term "library services" or "media services." Dr. Demmert said that he has heard both. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested "library and learning resources."

Mr. Fullerton said that the word "community" should be eliminated from the suggested bullet. Ms. Fine noted that her suggestion emphasized community because that is the focus of her work. Even though tribal community colleges house public libraries, they are not focusing solely on elementary and secondary students.

Mr. Ely suggested taking out the word "access." Some communities are served by bookmobiles. We do not want to send the message that we do not want those services. I like Janine's suggestion. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy reiterated that they should include "library and learning resources." Libraries tend to conjure certain images. I think this term would add something.

Dr. Demmert noted the amended addition on page 17: "Limited library and learning resources that answer cultural and academic needs."

Ms. Fine suggested changing the third bullet on page 19 to read as follows: "Overt and subtle racism in schools Native children attend, combined with the lack of a multicultural focus in the schools, classrooms, and libraries that could promote understanding among students of all races."

Dr. Demmert called for comments for or against the suggested change. Mr. Ely said that he would leave the bullet as drafted. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said there is also racism in school boards, curriculum, etc.

Ms. Fine suggested adding the word "librarians" to the fourth bullet on page 23 so that it would read: "An increase in the number of Native teachers, administrators, librarians, and university professors teaching in the nation's public schools and universities."

Mr. Hill questioned if librarians were different from teachers. The general response from the Task Force was "yes." Ms. Fine said that they do need an increase in the number of librarians. Dr. Demmert said they should include librarians. Mr. Hill said he wondered who else they did not include. Mr. Ely said he was afraid that they would now have to include everyone. He cited a study that showed the importance of a custodian on the success of high school students. Do we also have to include custodians? Mr. Fullerton said he would like to include librarians because they are the heart of a school in terms of resources. Mr. Ely said that they would then have to add coaches and everyone else.

Mr. Hill said that these additions were being made only because the Task Force had a librarian review the report. But how cumbersome do we have to make the report to be all-inclusive? Dr. Demmert asked Ms. Pease-Windy Boy to serve as a mediator. She said this has to do with the development of professional educators. Indians are always paraprofessionals, but they are never teachers, librarians, or counselors. Maybe using the term "professional educators" would be best. Dr. Demmert said that using the phrase "increasing the number of professional Indians" would be more general. Mr. Ely said that he thought they should add the word "librarian."

Dr. Demmert read the amended bullet as follows: "An increase in the number of Native teachers, administrators, librarians, and university professors teaching in the nation's public schools and universities."

Dr. White said the term "librarian" was not acceptable to everyone in this position in his state; they prefer the term "media specialist."

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said they should scratch the word "teaching" from the bullet Dr. Demmert just read because administrators do not teach.

Dr. Demmert suggested two more minor amendments on page 23. The first bullet should read: "Increase recognition by state and local educational agencies that they have a responsibility to improve academic performance, reduce dropout rates, and develop programs that meet the language and cultural needs of Native students." The second bullet should read: "The development of limited parent-based early childhood education models in Native communities and Indian reservations."

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy questioned his motives for changing the second bullet. Dr. Demmert explained that he wanted to show that this was not in all communities. Buck Martin said that this statement was against progress. Mr. Ely said that he would leave it as drafted. Dr. Demmert agreed to leave it.

Dr. Charleston called attention to the stem at the top of the page that points to the progress made by Indians. I ask the Task Force to look at this statement and then show how Minneapolis is an exemplary program when it has no graduates. Do we believe this to be true?

Dr. Demmert said that there has been an increase in librarians. Dr. Demmert then said to scratch out the addition just discussed, but to leave in Janine's suggestion to take out "teaching."

Ms. Fine suggested adding "librarians" to the second full paragraph on page 43 so that the first sentence would read: "The lack of school teachers, librarians, administrators, doctors, university faculty, scientists and other skilled individuals from within the American Indian and Alaska Native communities...." Dr. Demmert said that this idea was captured under "other skilled individuals." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said she found it hard to use the words "skilled" with "professional" because those words are generally used to differentiate between vocations and professions. I think we can say "professional individuals" and that would include librarians. Mr. Fullerton said that he would add "librarian" and scratch out the word "skilled".

Mr. Hill said that he loved libraries and librarians, but was concerned about having a librarian present to lobby for the final report. This is not proper. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy disagreed and said that if we did not have librarians, teachers and students would not have the resources they needed. Mr. Lewis agreed with Mr. Hill and said that the presence of Ms. Fine was out of order. The time for her input was during the testimony. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she could not afford to send a librarian to the hearings, and the annual conference of the National Indian Education Association (NIEA) does not attract librarians. There were certain sectors underrepresented at our hearings. This is a shortcoming of our report that needs to be included.

Dr. Demmert said that the Task Force would look at Ms. Fine's suggestions quickly and decide whether to include them or not. This is our last shot at receiving input so we should hear her suggestions. On that last amendment we will scratch "skilled" and add "professional." We will agree to put in "librarian" and can reconsider this point later if we need to.

Ms. Fine said that she would only give the most significant recommendations. When you talk about partners I think it is significant to include librarians. Page 49, number two, should read: "Develop partnerships among schools and parents, tribes, universities, tribal community libraries, business and industry, and health and social service agencies."

Dr. Demmert said that even though he agreed with Ms. Pease-Windy Boy and Mr. Fullerton about the importance of libraries, when he wrote down "schools," he was referring to schools with libraries. Ms. Fine said that if they are not specifically mentioned, libraries will be lost. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that if the schools are not partners with libraries, the library services might not get down to the schools. Mr. Hill noted that they talk about separate institutions, schools and libraries. Ms. Fine said that they also need to talk about tribal community libraries. Dr. Demmert said that they will not add libraries there, but there might be a place where libraries fit more appropriately.

Ms. Fine suggested the following change on page 61, the second bullet under recommendations for local governments and schools: "Ensure that school budgets address the multicultural educational needs of the citizens served by the local schools and community libraries." After deciding that her recommended wording would not be appropriate, she suggested the following change to the third bullet of that section: "Provide opportunities for parents form the multicultural communities to develop partnerships with school and tribal libraries serving their communities."

Dr. Demmert said that if there were no objections he would make the change. Dr. White said they should not just think in terms of textbooks but also of electronic media. Ms. Fine said that this is very broad and does include non-print. Dr. White said they were moving away from books. Dr. Demmert asked Dr. White to write down any suggestions he may have on this topic.

Ms. Fine then made the following recommendation for the third bullet on page 70: "Promote the training of American Native professionals in science, mathematics, law, engineering, medicine, business, library and information science, the social sciences and related fields as a national priority."

Mr. Hill said that he would like to debate this later. In the context of the national agenda I may disagree. Dr. Demmert suggested debating it here. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that there were so few Indian librarians. Ms. Fine said that there is a fellowship program for librarians but in the last 25 years only about 50 people went through the program, and most of those did not stay to work on the reservation. We do need people with expertise.

Mr. Ely suggested having only one bullet on librarians. There is a continuity in the report that will be broken. If we want to emphasize librarians then let's find one place and put it in. Mr. Hill agreed. Dr. Demmert asked Ms. Pease-Windy Boy to look through the report and develop verbiage on librarians.

Mr. Martin said that he had problems with the word "some" in the following sentence on page vii: "Unfortunately, there is a public record of discrimination and lack of educational opportunity among some Native students." Dr. Demmert said they would come back to this page.

Mr. Martin then referred the Task Force to the quote in the margin on page 11 and asked if the author's tribe could be mentioned so that the reader did not have to go to the notes in the back of the report to get a sense of who made the statement. Dr. Demmert said that Harry Gamble suggested using short quotes. This quote is particularly long and when I read it my train of thought was broken. Mr. Hill said he thought the quotes were okay and agreed that the name of the tribe should be included.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy was concerned that all of the quotes came from professional educators and were not representative of a diverse group. Some are professionals who are parents, but I think it would be wise to look for quotes from community people. As professional educators we know all of these people. This looks like a professional educators club.

Dr. Demmert summarized the recommendations for quotes: (1) use the name and tribe, (2) tighten the quotes, and (3) use quotes from parents and other community members.

Mr. Martin referred to page 15 where the report considers the loss of culture and language. The report mentions the Lumbees, but there are a number of other tribes that have lost their Native language. Dr. Demmert said that he mentioned the Lumbees only as an example of tribes that have lost their language. Mr. Tullis asked why the report uses the Lumbees as an example when people question if they are truly a tribe. There are other recognized tribes that have lost their language. Why don't we use the Mohawks or Penobscotts so that we do not create any controversy? Mr. Ely said he did not think they needed to identify any tribes.

Mr. Lewis said that research on language was conducted at the University of Atlanta. It breaks down how many indigenous languages there are and what percentage have lost their fluency. The report talks specifically about American Indians. Out of 2,000 languages, there are now only about 262 tribes or groups who speak their Native language. I cannot remember the name of the researchers. Buck Martin said that those figures sounded impressive. Dr. Demmert asked Mr. Lewis to add a sentence referring to that research and add a citation in the bibliography. Mr. Hill said that research really points toward the extinction of Native languages.

Dr. Demmert asked the Task Force if it had any other general comments to make. Mr. Martin referred to page 15 and the following discussion on Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores: "Indeed, the scores of Natives on the SAT college entrance exam are higher than for most other minority groups (Chart 4) but tragically, as many as 35 percent and in some places 50 to 60 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native students leave school early." The table showing higher scores of Native children does not state our case. On the other hand, the narrative does show that while the SAT scores are higher than other minority groups, there is still tragedy. The table alone does not state our case. Here is one place where we need to tie the chart to the narrative.

Mr. Hill said that the American College Test (ACT) and the SAT scores are misleading because only college-bound students take these tests. When we look at this in context, it is only the best of the best who take these tests. We either need to show how many kids are taking these tests, or we need to put in baseline data for all students. That chart does not show reality. Furthermore, generally students on the east coast take the SAT and those on the west coast take the ACT. This also is misleading because most Native Americans take the ACT. Dr. Ginsburg agreed and said they may only want to show ACT scores.

Mr. Hill questioned whether they could include Iowa Test of Basic Skills or California Achievement Test scores. Dr. Demmert said this would be problematic because of the inherent problems in testing elementary and secondary students, such as language barriers. We need to carefully evaluate whether those charts add or subtract to the report. Mr. Hill said that they skew data down just like the ACT. Dr. Charleston explained that the purpose of including the data on math SAT scores was because this is the most positive data available. CAT and Iowa scores show low achievement that decline over years.

Dr. Demmert said that in addition to mentioning the lack of students going to college, it is also important to show that we have youngsters who are capable of going to college, but of those, only 30 or 40 percent make it through. The rest either drop out or do not fend well. Mr. Hill said he thought the report was promoting an image that was falsely positive. Some students do well, but only a very small percentage. Dr. Demmert suggested that they show the small number of students going to college.

Mr. Tullis said that one problem was eligibility and who was counted as Indian. Some students in Title V programs have never been on a reservation or even knew they were Indian until they were counted for the program. There is distortion in the data.

Dr. Demmert said that he thought Mr. Hill was right and they should take out SAT scores and leave in ACT scores. Furthermore, in order to be more accurate, they should also include the number of students who take the test. Dr. Charleston noted that he knew the number of students taking the ACT, but he doubted if he could get a percentage of high school graduates. We do not have decent data on this. Mr. Hill asked if there were at least good projections. Dr. Charleston replied that he did not know of any.

Mr. Tullis asked if they could put Chart 4 on page 14 so that it is as near as possible to its reference in the text.

Mr. Hill expressed his shock at having statistics on high school dropouts but not on graduates. Dr. Demmert said that surveys ask specific questions and very little has been done to isolate the Indian population in these studies. Mr. Tullis said that the numbers get distorted depending on what part of the year they are taken. Dr. Ginsburg said that the data they had was from a one-time effort in 1980. If we look at the current graduation level we will have problems. Mr. Hill said that if we cannot count high school graduates we will have serious data problems.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that the data on pages 10 through 26 come from the NELS:88 data that only account for about 200 Indian students. This is a very small sample. Dr. Charleston concurred with Dr. Tippeconnic. The sample is small and it is questionable who these people are. However, even this sample is consistent with better samples. I have problems with the 1988 National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS:88) because the researchers did a poor job. Dr. Ginsburg clarified that although this sample of only 200 or 300 Indian students may be a problem, it is our only data source. This is your call if it is not what you want.

Dr. Demmert summarized the issues with the data: (1) it is old, dating from 1988, (2) the sample is small, (3) there are not other sources of information, and (4) even though it is old and small, the information is consistent with what we know.

Dr. Charleston said that even though the statistics are not distorted, it is very poor research. By putting it in the report we are condoning and blessing it. However, this is all we have. Dr. Tippeconnic suggested using the data but putting in a qualifying statement.

Dr. Ginsburg said that it was not really old. The chart on Page 18, "Feeling One Cannot Control Own Future," is fairly instructive. Some people call this locus of control. Native students come out at the low end on this measure. They feel they cannot control their own futures, but I am not sure why. We cannot get this data anywhere else. The question is, should we put it in or not.

Dr. Demmert said that they need to go through the charts to decide which ones help make the statements they are trying to convey. Dr. Tippeconnic said the question is whether or not they should include this data at all, and if so, what type of qualifying statement do they need to make. Dr. Demmert reiterated this point saying that if the charts are included, the report will include a qualifying statement. The question is do we include them.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that this is a nation at risk study. If the data is used to document the at-riskness, we can learn something significant from it, especially if there are no other studies available. The chart on page 12 does represent something significant.

> I would like to make a comment on the chart on page 18 about the locus of control. There is a lot of research on this topic done by Indians. I have seen several dissertations on this. There is a difference between control in society, in the family, and in the community. For Indians, individualism is not as important as the community. What is this chart showing? I know very successful people whose locus of control would show up negative like this.

Dr. Charleston said that we do not know if we are talking about urban, rural, or reservation youth. We just do not know what this data is talking about. Mr. Ely said that the Task Force will have to defend their report. If the graph is important, we need to find one that is dependable. Mr. Hill added that there is a difference in locus of control in own our communities and in the white community. By using data and research that is so thin we are putting our report at risk. Dr. Demmert said they must look at the charts to see if they are important enough. He then drew attention to the chart on page 12. Mr. Hill noted that the chart does not explain who the students are that it refers to. Dr. Demmert said that if it helps make the report a quality report, it is important. Mr. Ely said that it is not important because this information can be picked up in the supplemental part.

Dr. White said that it appears that the Task Force did want this information. Maybe we should point out the lack of information. Maybe we need to recommend the collection of information over a long range of time.

Dr. Demmert asked if it was possible to use information from the effective schools research. Or is that not the right information base? Dr. Ginsburg said that the factors included in this research base are suitable. The problem is where to get the information. The characteristics are important, but where do we get the numbers? Dr. Demmert said that they may not want the numbers. Dr. Charleston said that the plan of research was good. It will be interesting to see where Indians fall. We need to deal correctly with Indian kids, but the numbers for Indians are flawed. Ms. Pease Windy-Boy asked whether they were the right indicators. Dr. Demmert agreed that the indicators were consistent with other research endeavors. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that poverty suggests problems in school. Maybe that is as far as we can go if we cannot defend the sample.

Mr. Hill asked why the data were included if we knew it to be faulty. Dr. White reiterated that the data were all they had. Mr. Hill said that people should not include this just because there is no other data. This is a point we should articulate clearly. Also, this research is using a white measuring stick. What is our measuring stick?

Mr. Ely said that we need to be true to our values, but we also need to pick the pockets of the white folks. If we cannot defend the data we cannot put it in the report. Dr. Demmert said that is why they need to go through the charts one at a time. When we go back to the testimony, there are some things to remember. Indian parents want the same kinds of things that other parents want. They want their children to do well in school and to know their reading, writing, and arithmetic. Additionally, they want their children to know their Native language and culture. There is a report from the Southwest that brings in these aspects as the top three priorities. There are some problems with the research on Indians and we do not know if it is regionally or locally based. The national research is not good, but it may be good enough to include. I do not want to throw it all out.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested that they table this temporarily. There is a new National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report that just came out. Let me check on that to see if any of it would be appropriate for our report. Dr. Demmert agreed to hold any further discussion on the charts.

Mr. Hill said that this is kissing up to white standards. My 18-year-old daughter wants to go to Smith college and so now she has to perform on the SAT. We talk about community and self-determination. We talk about controlling our own destiny and choosing our own leader. I think our report and the data we present play into the system. We have not done well since 1794. I would rather take a new look, find our own data, and determine what that means for the Indian community. I think we have the wrong template down.

Dr. Beaulieu said that Mr. Hill was right. I suggest Indian education programs be developed so we can meet those standards. I also say we need schools to be responsive to Native children. We need tests and measures to determine the successes of schools. It is so ingrained that we must measure according to the standards of what is out there. This is making our programs sterile and institutionalized. We may need a section on testing, testing biases, and how testing propels educational services. As people are beginning to look at outcome measures, we may need to discuss biases of tests.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that because the Task Force looked at the current situation, they may need to add a bullet that addresses the issue of test biases. There are very few pieces of reliable data. There is bias in testing as shown through the research, but this issue is not in our report. This is something we talked about in past meetings. Dr. Demmert agreed that they needed to add a bullet and asked Ms. Pease-Windy Boy to put one together.

Mr. Lewis said that they need to expand and clarify the section on page 25, "Current Support for Native Education Research and Good Practice." This research is not only about Native Americans, but it is about education in general. We need to revise this section so that we discuss the scantiness and poor quality of the research. We also need to discuss how the research on education improvement in general relates to Native education.

> Page 26 refers to six areas upon which the Task Force focused. I think that the idea of systematic change and educational leadership should be number one. The others are more program oriented. I understand what Norbert Hill is saying. Some items are linked to what we do in our tribal communities, though we do not need the label "Indian" on them.
>
> There is national research in other areas that can be linked to Native Americans. I hear what Norbert is saying. Some items match what we do in tribal communities and do not need the Indian label on them.

Mr. Hill said that smart kids also drop out of school. We lose some of our best kids and we still have a clash of culture. Mike Charleston's first report mentioned that. It also mentioned the bias in testing. We ought to stop taking tests and we will still get into Penn State. However, because we have no political clout we play into the system and keep taking tests.

Mr. Tullis referred the Task Force back to page 27 and suggested they mention that although there is a substantial amount of research-based information, very little is directed at Native Americans.

Dr. Demmert suggested that they take a break and think about how to change this. We will present a rewrite either today or tomorrow. Are there any other places that we need to rework? I would also like Buck Martin to address what we are doing with the report.

Mr. Ely asked if the Task Force was going to address adult education. Dr. Demmert requested that Dr. Tippeconnic write something on that topic, which he agreed to do.

Dr. Demmert asked Buck Martin, Director of the White House Conference, to discuss what will happen with the Task Force's report.

Buck Martin said that one of the things that was very evident and reinforced as he traveled around was that there have been a lot of reports and information emerging from Indian country over the past 20 years that identify problems and make recommendations. Prominent in identifying this information will be the INAR Task Force report. I emphasize that people in Indian country are putting a great deal of emphasis on the findings of this report. They hope to get a sense of solutions. In addition to the Task Force, there is a lot of material from NIEA's resolutions and fact findings. There is also the annual report from NACIE. A lot of material exists. I anticipate that the White House Conference will take all of this material to the next step.

> We will not be conducting hearings like you did. We will look closely at your report and take it to the next step. We want to implement your recommendations. Your involvement will be very important because your report will be a significant part of the conference. Assistant Secretary John MacDonald indicated that it is quite likely that staff from his department might be available to work with us to continue this effort. We do want to take this to the next step. You have two advisory members of the White House Conference on this Task Force, Eddie Tullis and Bob Swan, so there will be a continuity of effort. We want to take this report and implement it.

Dr. Ginsburg said that in addition to the White House conference, some things can be done through legislation. John Tippeconnic has some discretionary authority. There is also some other authority in the U.S. Department of Education to move forward. The Secretary's America 2000 will be a follow-up to your recommendations where we do have authority. The Elementary and Secondary Education (Title V) Act will be up for reauthorization so we can integrate some of your recommendations into that legislation. We will probably start that process in the summer. There is not just one opportunity.

Dr. Tippeconnic said he had no additional comments. What we want to do is to utilize the report in the Department.

Dr. Demmert said he has worked with staff in Congress and they have indicated interest in the report. They are interested in holding a joint hearing in the House and Senate on our report. It will be unfortunate if this is a missed opportunity and our report is not out. They will not hold a hearing on a draft report. However, there is still a possibility they will hold a hearing this year or next. But I think this is a missed opportunity this year if we cannot get the report out.

> For publicity it would be best if we could get the report out before USA Today loses its interest. This is important because that is a national paper. I also want to get into national organizations. Some have already said they want to promote the report, and some are interested in having someone talk to us. There are already people who want to implement our report. Groups that have expressed interest include the Council of Chief State School Officers and national curriculum groups such as that for biology. On Monday I will be meeting with the public health agency about their coordinated role.
>
> Activity is taking place, and activity is under way for the next step. You as Task Force members should think about your role. Eddie Tullis can act as the chair of NACIE and the White House Conference. Alan Ginsburg and John Tippeconnic are looking at what can be done in the administration. Byron Fullerton can work with the politicians he knows across the country. Norbert Hill can look into the private sector. We all have the opportunity to influence the states and the country.

Mr. Hill said that they ought to be as aggressive as possible instead of waiting for people to pick up the report. Believing in discretionary authority is like believing in the tooth fairy because people never speak up for us. People will be polite and take the report, but they will be passive about doing anything. We need to think of that bond we created when collecting testimony. Help is not on the way; we need to help ourselves. Dr. Demmert added that the National Policy Center generally supports the work of the Task Force and may make policy recommendations based on the final report. Mr. Hill reiterated that the Task Force should not let the report drop.

Dr. Tippeconnic asked the Task Force to keep in mind supporting documents such as the commissioned papers. People need to see those papers; they need wide dissemination. Dr. Demmert agreed that they needed to put the commissioned papers in the ERIC system in addition to pursuing other forms of distribution.

Mr. Fullerton asked how the report would be released and to whom it would be distributed. Will it be released by the Secretary? Dr. Demmert said that he would like Dr. Ginsburg to address the issue of the release of the report at the close of the session. Mr. Martin questioned whether their plan for dissemination should be included in the conclusion. Mr. Ely said that they need a strategy, but it does not necessarily belong in the report. One-half of the strategy will be covert so we need to follow our plan carefully. Mr. Martin said that it was important to address their strategy in the report.

At 11:50 pm Dr. Demmert called for a break until 1:30 pm so that the Task Force members could work on the pieces they were assigned and also enjoy lunch.

Monday, June 10, 1991 - Afternoon Session

At 1:45 pm Dr. Demmert reconvened the meeting and opened the floor for discussion on several points raised during lunch.

Mr. Lewis said that he did not want to belabor the point, but from his discussion over lunch he saw a need to clarify and discuss some issues. First, there were several recommendations made during the teleconference and I am curious why they were not included in the report. Also, I want to know where this is all going. I suggest that we hold a discussion for 30 or 35 minutes to get clarity on where this is all going. With support of the chair, I think we should break into a private caucus of Task Force members.

Dr. Demmert said that he did not know if they had the authority to break into a private caucus. Dr. Ginsburg said that if it was an official part of business it needed to be in the pubic record. However, Dr. Demmert could postpone the start of the meeting. Mr. Hill supported Hayes Lewis' suggestion. Mr. Fullerton said that a judgment was once made against people for talking in the restroom and those people were not even talking business!

Dr. Demmert said they could go off the record but he thought that Mr. Fullerton had a good point and there was a limited number of items that they could discuss. Mr. Lewis said that maybe they needed to discuss issues openly about how they should proceed.

Dr. Demmert announced that the forthcoming discussion would be off the record, after which the Task Force continued meeting in closed session.

Monday, June 10, 1991 - Afternoon Session - Continued

At 2:55 pm, the Task Force resumed the open session. Dr. Demmert suggested that they proceed by looking at the recommendations, starting on page 53 with the recommendations for parents of Native children. To me this is one of the most important parts. The recommendations in general are important, but this piece dealing with parents and the tribes is especially important because these are things that we can do ourselves as Indian people. The states and federal government are not as necessary if we believe in true self-determination. They just make it easier for us.

There are three issues to consider: (1) the order of the partnerships mentioned; (2) the nature of the recommendations; and (3) whether each recommendation should be included or not. Can we move parents to the front end based on our conversation during the last meeting? Let's start with specifics and decide whether or not each recommendation should be included. As we talk, people will bring up the order if there is a problem. I will start by reading them one at a time. The importance of partners is a theme running through the report.

Recommendations for partners

Introduction: Within the strategic framework, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for specific partners responsible for the education of Native children.

Dr. Tippeconnic suggested that the last word of the introduction on partners include adults so that it would read "Native children and adults." Dr. Demmert agreed to make the change unless any Task Force members opposed it. All other Task Force members agreed.

Introduction Amended: *Within the strategic framework, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for specific partners responsible for the education of Native children and adults.*

Recommendations for parents of Native children

(1) Take responsibility for being your children's first and most important teacher, especially in the development of their language base.

Mr. Hill asked if "language base" referred to English or children's Native language. Dr. Demmert clarified that it referred to any language base.

The recommendation was accepted as drafted.

(2) Become active in school and parent-teacher activities to ensure that the school is measuring up to your expectations, and to show support for schooling as important to your children's development.

Mr. Ely asked if "schooling" was the accepted way of referring to education. Dr. Demmert said that it was a more contemporary term. Mr. Ely commented that people used to say that a person could get an education apart from schooling. Peopled graduated without knowing much. That was called school. Dr. Ginsburg said that this recommendation refers to schools because it includes being active in the school and holding the school accountable. Education is a broader term.

Dr. Charleston suggested that they eliminate the comma after the word "expectations."

There was further discussion on this bullet during discussion on the following bullet (number three), as recorded under the following discussion.

#2 Amended: *Become active in school and other activities to ensure that the school is measuring up to your expectations and to show support for schooling as important to your children's development.*

(3) Work with your local, tribal, and national political representatives to ensure that proper attention is paid to improving schools and schooling.

Dr. White suggested that they add the word "state."

Mr. Ely suggested that the ending say "...improving schools and education" because he felt "schools and schooling" was repetitive. Dr. Demmert said that the phrase refers to two things; schools are places where schooling occurs. Dr. Beaulieu said that the function of schools is to educate. When we focus on schools and schooling we are talking about process. Mr. Hill commented that his grandmother used to say that going to school and getting an education were two different things. Dr. Demmert said that the term "schooling" was accepted in the vernacular.

Mr. Lewis asked if there was a place for parents in the decision-making process. Parents have a place outside of the school; they should also be able to decide what is taught in school. Mr. Ely said he thought that was captured in their recommendation. Dr. Beaulieu said we need to have a recommendation for what parents can do to make changes in the school. Maybe it does fit in here.

Dr. Demmert asked if they needed a fourth bullet. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that they may. Parent involvement and control is important in this report. Historically parents have not had any control. Dr. Demmert agreed that the section on parents was not strong enough. Dr. Tippeconnic suggested that they make decision making a part of this section. Dr. Demmert questioned who would decide what decisions they could make. Mr. Lewis said the bullet could be structured to make parents a part of the decision-making process and then they would really be involved. Dr. White said that politically they have a say in decision making by voting. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that as is, the bullet does not show that parents can be board members. Parents do not have to be on the outside. Mr. Ely said that parents need the ability to participate and force policy; however, it would undermine schools having parents participate in administration.

Dr. Demmert noted that there was a section on parents on page 67 in the recommendations for the federal government. Dr. Demmert read the following bullet (second on page 67), changing only the first word from "authorize" to "require": "Require tribes, Native communities, and parents of Native children, in partnership with public and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, to participate in the development, implementation, and evaluation of local, state, and federal plans." This is the governance piece. Mr. Ely agreed that the point they were making was stated in this bullet.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that parents are not going to look at the section for the federal government. They will look at the parent section and follow those recommendations. Parent involvement means very little. It means bringing cookies to class. That is all schools ever want parents to do.

Dr. Demmert questioned how they should rewrite the federal recommendation bullet. Mr. Lewis said that he did not want parents to be involved in the micromanagement of schools. I want administrators to be accountable to parents. Dr. Charleston suggested they consider the President's and Secretary's policy on choice. They ask parents to be responsible for choosing and holding institutions responsible. I think the President's and Secretary's policy is far ahead of what we are saying. Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Charleston to write a short paragraph on choice.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that the report should also encourage parents to attend school board meetings or vote in school elections. Also, in the parent participation section we can suggest literacy and parent involvement with homework.

Dr. Demmert said he thought they should amend the second and third bullets to incorporate the suggestions of Janine Pease-Windy Boy and Hayes Lewis. We need a fourth bullet on choice. Mr. Lewis said that it was not his intention for parents to micromanage the schools, but Indian parents need their place. There must be some other strategy to employ parents because they are as important as we are. Mr. Tullis agreed that something needed to be included.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that there are other areas in education where we have direct parent involvement. In special education parents must approve the individual education plan for their child; they must be informed and know the needs of their child. Responsibility is given to parents to make decisions. Dr. Demmert agreed. The second and third bullets were intended to do that, but the wording is not strong enough. We need more specific language.

Dr. Tippeconnic suggested they needed to add another bullet recommending parents to continue learning throughout life and model learning for their children. This relates to adult education.

Dr. Ginsburg suggested incorporating Janine Pease-Windy Boy's comment on parenting skills. The first bullet on page 57, under recommendations for school officials and educators, reads: "...Welcome parents, tribal leaders, and other members of the community as partners. Show them ways to become involved and develop a sense of ownership for their children's education." To this we can add "provide access to parenting and literacy skills." Janine, does this capture your suggestions? Ms. Pease-Wind Boy said that it needs to be a direct statement to parents. Dr. Ginsburg noted that if someone else is providing parents with skills, it becomes the responsibility of the providers. Dr. Demmert suggested adding the following phrase: "take responsibility for ensuring skills."

Dr. White said that some schools throughout the nation increase parent participation through the use of school improvement teams. This is a process whereby parents have to be involved in making policy decisions. This process would be established by statute.

Dr. Demmert suggested the second bullet in the parent recommendations read as follows: "Take responsibility to ensure that schools measure up to the expectations of parents." Mr. Lewis suggested the following for the second bullet: "Become active participants in school and other activities to ensure that the education services and opportunities measure up to your expectations."

Mr. Ely said that he liked the word "responsibility" because it encompassed Ms. Pease-Windy Boy's suggestions. I suggest it read "Take responsibility and participate to ensure that schools...."

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that she thought parents will find a way to access parenting skills. There was one year in which I concentrated on what I was doing as a parent. We need to encourage parents to find parenting skills. I want the message to go directly to parents. Dr. Demmert said they could say "improve and continue parenting skills."

Mr. Lewis suggested they leave the second bullet as is. The concept of responsibility is important and we could put it in the title of the section as follows: "Responsibilities for parents of Native children." Dr. Demmert said this changes the nature of the format. One set is recommendations, the other is responsibilities.

Dr. Charleston said that this was an issue they should think about. Responsibility is something that we have. A recommendation is something new, an alternate course. Most parents know we have responsibilities to our children. Parents know they have responsibility for language development and we do these things. On the other side, Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that there are new parents out there. If you were a parent in 1972 you are not necessarily a parent in 1991.

Dr. Charleston said that the concept of responsibility is important. Dr. Demmert said he thought they were talking about recommendations. We need to talk about responsibility within our recommendations. I would prefer to leave recommendations intact and pick up responsibility in the wording. We are getting too bogged down with the second bullet.

Mr. Ely said that he has been to educational meetings where people say that parents need to be involved. They say "here is what to do"; they do not say "you need to be responsible." They step over the issue instead of making a clear statement that parents are responsible. I do not think we should soft-shoe around. We should say "you are responsible." If they see it in black and white they will say "we are responsible."

Dr. Demmert offered a compromise. The second bullet could say "Take personal responsibility to ensure that the school is measuring up to your expectations...." The third bullet can stay as is. Then we can add another bullet that says "Develop your parenting skills and continue learning throughout life." Other words we can use include "continue your education" or "lifelong learning." Dr. Tippeconnic expressed preference for the phrase "continue learning throughout life."

Dr. Charleston suggested the following bullet on parental choice: "Hold schools accountable for education outcomes by exercising choice in enrolling your children in the most effective school available." Mr. Hill questioned how that would play out in Snowflake, Arizona. Dr. Charleston replied that in some communities this is more difficult; however, most communities have choices between public, private, and BIA schools. Choice works as an accountability option.

Dr. Demmert said he realized the administration was pushing this issue; however, many Indian communities do not have many options. I do agree that holding schools accountable is important. Dr. Charleston said that the second bullet was not strong enough, specifically the concept of "ensuring" that schools measure up to parents' expectations. We need to hold schools accountable. We need to ensure that teaching and learning is occurring. In some areas choice is an option, in other areas it is not.

Bob Martin questioned whether choice was tied to the voucher system and whether the Task Force was implying that it embraced that idea. I have reservations about that. Dr. Charleston said that they almost have a de facto voucher system now in Indian education. If you put a student in a BIA school, the money follows the child. If you put a child in a public school during count week, that school gets Impact Aid. The money follows the child, just like in a voucher system. I think that parents should take the children out of schools that are not effective and make schools competitive. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that the choice system will result in students going from one school to another and there will be no consistency. We would be telling parents to move their children around.

Dr. Demmert referred the Task Force back to the second bullet. We took out the important piece of being active. We should say "Take personal responsibility and become active in school and other activities...." Mr. Lewis suggested "Take responsibility to actively participate in school and other activities." Mr. Ely said they need to be responsible and participate. These are two different things. One is to become active. The other is to be responsible. Dr. Demmert then suggested "Take responsibility for, and become active in school and other activities." The next bullet should read, "Hold schools accountable for educational outcomes."

Mr. Ely suggested they go on to the next bullet and come back to this later, or they will be here until nightfall. Dr. Demmert agreed to put a question mark by this and continue on. This is an important piece.

From this conversation, bullet number two was amended as written above, bullet number three was accepted as drafted, and the following two bullets were added:

Added: *Develop your parenting skills and continue learning throughout life.*

Added: *Hold schools accountable for education outcomes.*

Recommendations for school officials and educators

(1) Motivate students with realistically high expectations. Teach them the skills they need to choose vocational, technical, business, or other professional careers.

Dr. Beaulieu said that the first bullet was exclusionary. Teachers need high expectations of students because that is motivational. I suggest we say "Maintain high expectations...." Dr. Demmert suggested "Promote and maintain high expectations for all Native students."

#1 Amended: *Promote and maintain high expectations for all students. Teach them the skills they need to choose vocational, technical, business, or other professional careers.*

(2) Make the curriculum academically challenging. Integrate the historical and cultural perspective of Native Americans.

Mr. Hill suggested this bullet say "historical, contemporary, and cultural perspective." Dr. Beaulieu agreed that this needed to be emphasized. The culture is the tribe. There is not just a general Native American culture. Mr. Ely said that he thought this concept was covered by the term "contemporary."

#2 Amended: *Make the curriculum academically challenging. Integrate the contemporary, historical, and cultural perspective of Native Americans.*

(3) Outlaw any overt or subtle racism in the school. Establish a code of conduct for students, teachers, and administrators, and enforce it. Give education a multicultural focus to promote understanding among all races.

Dr. Demmert asked if they were really saying "outlaw." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested "recognize overt or subtle racism," or "be aware of the effects of overt or subtle racism." Mr. Fullerton suggested the word "eliminate." Mr. Ely supported the word "eliminate."

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said the problem was that people in school do not necessarily recognize the forms of racism Indian students experience. In this bullet we are saying that teachers should recognize and eliminate.

Dr. Demmert suggested they omit the first sentence.

#3 Amended: *Establish a code of conduct for students, teachers, and administrators, and enforce it. Give education a multicultural focus to eliminate racism and promote understanding among all races.*

(4) Make the school comfortable and safe for students. Keep it free of alcohol and drugs.

Mr. Lewis suggested adding the word "adults." Dr. Beaulieu suggested saying "Make the school comfortable, safe, and supportive...." Dr. Demmert said he thought comfortable was supportive. He then suggested, "Make schools comfortable and a safe place for students and adults.

#4 Amended: *Make the school a comfortable and safe place. Keep it free of alcohol and drugs.*

(5) Recruit and train top-quality teachers and administrators. Encourage and reward them. Seek out educators from the Native community, who can serve as role models.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said to use the word "develop" instead of "train."

Mr. Tullis said he thought retention was important. It is a problem in Indian country keeping qualified people. Dr. Beaulieu said that there was not always the opportunity to retain people because of union and seniority rules.

Dr. Demmert said the order should read, "train, recruit, and retain." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy reiterated that they should use "develop" instead of "train" because it sounds like training a dog. I suggest "develop, recruit, and retain."

#5 Amended: *Develop, recruit, and retain top-quality teachers and administrators. Encourage and reward them. Seek out educators from the Native community, who can serve as role models.*

(6) Monitor the progress of students, and share the results with parents. Welcome parents, tribal leaders, and other members of the community as partners. Show them ways to become involved and develop a sense of ownership for their children's education.

Mr. Ely said to leave the bullet as drafted.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy referred to an earlier statement by Dr. Demmert asking Task Force members to look for places to refer to testing. It seems that results, as mentioned in this bullet, imply tests and measurement. Perhaps we can include "monitor the progress of students through tests that are sensitive to their Native language and culture." Mr. Fullerton suggested "culturally appropriate testing." Dr. Demmert proposed "Monitor the progress of students through measures appropriate to the Indian community."

Dr. Beaulieu said that they may need a different bullet. There is a general need for teachers and educators to use appropriate data to improve the curriculum. We could say "Utilize appropriate evaluation and assessment data to improve instruction." Schools always do assessments and send off the data to compare with other places. This information is seldom used in the classroom. Results from testing should not always be sent away; they should be used in the classroom.

Dr. Demmert suggested omitting the first sentence and using Dr. Beaulieu's suggestion. The first bullet can say "Monitor the progress of students and use appropriate assessment data to improve instruction and share results with parents." A second bullet can continue with "Welcome parents, tribal leaders, and other members of the community as partners. Show them ways to become involved and develop a sense of ownership for their children's education."

Added: *Monitor the progress of students, utilize appropriate evaluation and assessment information to improve instruction and share the results with parents.*

#6 Amended: *Welcome parents, tribal leaders, and other members of the community as partners. Show them ways to become involved and develop a sense of ownership for their children's education.*

(7) Show students the connection between what they learn in school and what they need to know to have productive and satisfying lives. Mentor them in their efforts to find jobs or go on to college.

Mr. Ely recommended deleting the last sentence.

Mr. Fullerton asked if mentoring referred to counseling. Dr. Demmert said it referred to someone who not only encourages students, but also helps them.

Dr. Beaulieu said that he was concerned about the tone because it may be paternalistic. Perhaps we can say "Help students explore the connection between what they learn in school and what they need to know." Dr. Demmert said he liked that change. Mr. Ely said he thought the first sentence sounded good.

Dr. Demmert said that mentorship is an important concept. Mr. Hill said that it is paternalistic. Mr. Ely said that there is nothing wrong with a little paternalism for high school students if we are able to show them that what they learn is purposeful.

Dr. Beaulieu recommended using the term "postsecondary."

#7 Amended: *Help students explore the connection between what they learn in school and what they need to know to have productive and satisfying lives. Encourage students in efforts to find jobs or go on to postsecondary education.*

(8) Work with the providers of health and social services to help reduce the difficulties facing many Native children.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that the emphasis is on drugs and alcohol and a need for safe places. Dr. Demmert asked if they needed specifics to bring that out. Mr. Hill said that it will become redundant after a while. Mr. Ely said that this bullet encompasses many things including problems with drugs and alcohol as well as other problems such as hunger. Dr. Beaulieu mentioned that often it is hard to get rid of difficulties, but we can help people cope. Mr. Tullis said he liked the bullet as drafted. Dr. Demmert said to leave the bullet as is.

(9) Explore the possibilities of forming partnerships with local colleges, business and industry, and other community organizations to expand the human and financial resources of schools.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy recommended beginning the sentence with "Form partnerships...." There was general agreement among Task Force members.

#9 Amended: *Form partnerships with local colleges, business and industry, and other community organizations to expand the human and financial resources of schools.*

Recommendations for tribal governments and Native communities

(1) Recognize tribal responsibility and accountability for the education of the children.

Dr. Tippeconnic suggested adding "adults" to this bullet.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy questioned what happens when tribal governments "recognize." They have to do something; we want them to be accountable. Mr. Ely suggested they say "recognize tribal responsibility and be accountable for the education of their children and adults."

#1 Amended: *Recognize tribal responsibility and be accountable for the education of all students.*

(2) Identify the pursuit of intellectual, cultural, social, spiritual, and physical development as tribal priorities.

Mr. Fullerton suggested that the bullet begin with "Pursue the intellectual...." Mr. Hill suggested adding "emotional." Dr. Demmert said that spiritual encompassed this. Dr. White suggested adding "economic." Dr. Demmert said that was a different topic. Mr. Ely said he liked the addition of "economic," but Dr. Demmert reiterated that it belonged in a different setting. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy questioned whether they should also mention "the development of children and adults."

#2 Amended: *Pursue the intellectual, cultural, social, spiritual, and physical development of all children and adults as tribal priorities.*

(3) Establish tribal education plans that define the purposes of education and outline the goals and strategies necessary to carry out those purposes.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy questioned how urban centers would interpret the mention of "tribal education plans." This should be inclusive. Dr. Demmert suggested "tribal/community education plans."

#3 Amended: *Establish tribal/community education plans that define the purposes of education and outline the goals and strategies necessary to carry out those purposes.*

(4) Provide financial and other kinds of support necessary to ensure development of the academic skills and training of professionals necessary to develop self-sufficient communities.

Mr. Ely asked if they were going to support only professionals. Mr. Tullis said that no community will be successful if it has only professionals. Mr. Ely said that unless other people are addressed elsewhere in the recommendations, they will be left out. Janine Pease-Windy Boy recommended including "professions and vocations." Mr. Fullerton suggested striking out the word "professions" and having "education personnel."

Dr. Demmert said the purpose of this bullet was the training of teachers, doctors, and lawyers--those who go to college. Mr. Ely asked what happens with the people who go off to be lawyers and never return to the Indian community. In Boulder everyone is studying to be environmental attorneys. When they graduate they will be unemployed. The same thing is happening on the reservations because we do not have jobs available. We need to include professionals as well as others. Mr. Ely said that we do not have professional jobs available--we have technical jobs.

Mr. Tullis suggested leaving the bullet as drafted. We need people who have academic skills. We can find carpenters and janitors. It sounds good as it is. Mr. Ely disagreed. If I want to be a doctor I can get financial support. However, if I want to be a welder, I have to go elsewhere. Mr. Tullis said that we need professionals to have a welding school available.

Dr. Demmert asked Bob Martin what percentage of the education budget in the BIA goes to vocational and technical training, as opposed to higher education. Bob Martin said that the number must be small. Dr. Demmert said that no, it was a large percentage. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that on her reservation the ratio was one to one. Dr. Beaulieu said that the ratio was 60 to 40 for the Minnesota Chippewas.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested the phrase "development of human resources."

Dr. Demmert said that Mr. Ely was rightfully challenging a bias. However, we do not have doctors, lawyers, or nurses. We do not have professionals except in law and education. I attempted to address that deficiency in our communities. I did not mean to imply that we do not need technicians. The question is do we need another bullet. Mr. Ely said that in order to maintain the integrity of Dr. Demmert's statement, the bullet should be left as is and another bullet should be added. Dr. Demmert asked Ms. Pease-Windy Boy to develop another bullet on technicians.

#4 Amended: *Provide financial and other kinds of support necessary to ensure development of the academic skills and training of professionals necessary to develop self-sufficient communities.*

In a later discussion, Mr. Ely suggested that the following bullet be added here. There was general agreement among Task Force members.

Added: *Support students seeking education in the vocational/technical fields.*

(5) Appoint tribal education representatives to work directly with local and state agencies to promote the tribe's education goals, and assist in the development of their education plans.

Dr. Beaulieu said that "appointment" was limiting. We should say "Work directly with...agencies and ensure these goals."

Mr. Ely explained that this bullet originated from a discussion concerning tribal leaders not being involved. The purpose of the bullet was to explicitly encourage the involvement of tribal leaders and therefore we should explicitly say "tribal leaders." We do not want them off the hook by sending their staff. I recommend we say "encourage tribal leaders...." We find weakness with tribal governments because they do not send any leadership to work with the schools. In Nevada if people other than the leader present recommendations, they are torn apart. But people pay attention to tribal leaders. Tribal leaders need to understand this because we need their support.

Dr. Demmert suggested, "Identify tribal leaders to work directly with local and state agencies...." Mr. Ely agreed to that amendment. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that U.S. representatives and senators have said that if education is so important to the tribe, why don't they ever see tribal chairs.

#5 Amended: *Appoint tribal leaders to work directly with local and state agencies to promote the tribe's education goals and ensure the representation of these goals in local education plans and initiatives.*

(6) Develop partnerships between schools and tribal government and business and industry to promote economic development on and near tribal lands.

Mr. Ely explained that the original purpose of this bullet was to tie economic development to education so that people would go out and get an education. The tribal government has the responsibility to ensure that people who leave the community for their education have something to return to. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that people address education as a shotgun approach instead of looking at the economy.

Dr. Demmert recommended saying, "...promote training for economic development on and near tribal lands." Mr. Ely said this assumes that the tribes are doing something to develop economically. If people know there is a reason to go to school, they will go. The government is responsible for the economic situation. I think we should scrap this bullet and start again.

Dr. Demmert asked Mr. Ely to look at the original version of this bullet. Mr. Ely said that a teacher earns $20,000 a year. A student then comes in with a TransAm. "Why do I need to go to school? There are no jobs anyway." The government needs to recognize that it needs to provide economic opportunity as an incentive.

During a later discussion, Mr. Ely suggested the following wording for this bullet. There was general agreement among Task Force members.

#6 Amended: *Recognize the need to develop economies with job opportunities as important motivation incentives to continue one's education.*

(7) Develop partnerships with government, philanthropic organizations, business and industry to create educational endowments (with tax adjustments) to help meet the costs of operating tribal schools and colleges.

This bullet was accepted as drafted.

At 4:20 pm, Dr. Demmert called for a ten-minute break.

Monday, June 10, 1991 - Afternoon Session - Continued

Recommendations for local governments and schools

(1) Remove social and political barriers that prevent Native residents in their communities from being elected to school boards.

Mr. Fullerton stated that they might need to use lawsuits to accomplish this.

The bullet was accepted as drafted.

(2) Ensure that school budgets address the multicultural educational needs of citizens served by the local schools.

Accepted as drafted.

(3) Provide opportunities for parents from the multicultural communities to develop partnerships with schools serving their communities.

Accepted as drafted.

(4) Give authority and responsibility for improving schools directly to the principals.

Dr. Demmert suggested adding "building partnerships" as another responsibility of principals. Mr. Fullerton asked whether the principals would then be able to delegate the responsibility. Dr Demmert responded that they could, but the principals would have the ultimate responsibility. Dr. White suggested that for emphasis they put "building partnerships" before "improving schools."

#4 Amended: *Give authority and responsibility for building partnerships and improving schools directly to the principals.*

(5) Insist upon the use of textbooks that provide accurate historical information on American Natives from a variety of perspectives.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that it was important to emphasize the need for sensitivity to Native language and culture. This is much like the historical concerns that we had earlier. Mr. Hill responded saying that the Task Force and the report cannot operate from a historical perspective.

#5 Amended: *Insist upon the use of textbooks and other library and learning resources that provide contemporary and historical information on American Natives from a variety of perspectives.*

Recommendations for state governments

(1) Develop comprehensive educational plans with local districts and tribal governments to meet the educational needs and improve the academic achievement level of Native students.

Accepted as drafted.

(2) Authorize state departments of education to provide funding and technical assistance to local schools to incorporate early childhood education principles in the primary grades, develop curricula that are culturally and linguistically appropriate for all grades, and provide inservice training of teachers on multicultural education.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that the word "multicultural" is watered down and often has little meaning for Native students. In Montana multicultural education does not include issues pertaining to Native students. Curriculum was developed that had a focus on Native issues, but no one used it. The important issue is to implement the curriculum that is already out there.

Dr. Beaulieu noted that often the state sets the standards and then the districts have to implement the policy. Dr. Demmert remarked that in Alaska the schools decide whether or not to use a certain curriculum.

Dr. Charleston said that authorizing something does not make state governments do anything. The word does not have enough clout. I recommend using "mandate" or "require," or a word that results in performance. Mr. Ely commented that he liked "require" better than "authorize" and he thought "multicultural" was an important word in this bullet. Dr. Charleston noted that often multiculturalism leads to Pan-Indianism and does not recognize the individual traits of Indians.

Dr. Beaulieu explained that Minnesota has undertaken a statewide effort for multicultural education, but it is a boondoggle. It promotes packaged stereotypes. Does the term multicultural education mean that the Task Force wants Indians to know about other people, or should other people incorporate issues pertaining to Indians into their curriculum? Dr. Demmert said that both would be appropriate responses to this bullet.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that they should say something about providing inservice training on Native educational issues.

#2 Amended: *Require state departments of education to allocate funding and technical assistance to local schools to incorporate early childhood education principles in the primary grades, develop curricula that are culturally and linguistically appropriate for all grades, and provide inservice training for teachers of Natives.*

(3) Provide specific funding for Native children in public schools that encourages schools to develop and use linguistically, culturally, and developmentally appropriate curricula.

Dr. White recommended that they change the word "provide" to "allocate." Dr. Charleston suggested that they drop "encourage" so that it would read more forcefully. Dr. Demmert stated that he thought "allocate specific funding" sounded good.

Dr. Charleston said that the bullet seemed to be addressing Impact Aid money or Title V and that they should drop the word "encourage" because it sounds like there is no real need to use the money to educate Native students. Dr. Demmert responded, saying that since the grants were competitive, they would only get money if it was intended for Native students. He asked if there was another word instead of "encourage." Dr. Beaulieu suggested just dropping it.

Dr. Charleston expressed his concern that over the past 20 years there has been a general trend towards public education through Impact Aid, accompanied by a general decrease in the number of tribal and BIA schools. Many children are being pulled out of tribal schools and being placed into public schools. I am worried that this bullet will promote that trend even more. I do not want to see more value being put in public schools over tribal schools.

Dr. Beaulieu stated that in Minnesota the state has worked it out so that tribal schools still do okay. The overall school environment is not being effected by the general move to public education. Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Beaulieu whether states give money to BIA schools, since the federal government is responsible for BIA and contract schools. Dr. Beaulieu said that they could transfer money to BIA schools from public schools. It is legal if it is between tribal and public schools. BIA schools also give money to students who do not receive other funds. Dr. Demmert stated that this program could run into trouble with the U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Beaulieu said that often Impact Aid money follows students to tribal schools when they switch.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that they say something in this bullet on the idea of equalizing funds. Dr. Demmert stated that the legislation requires 874 funds to go directly to schools and disallows equalizing funds.

Dr. Charleston expressed his agreement with the idea of improving education in public schools, but he emphasized that tribal education and Indian education are more important. I do not understand why we would push federal and BIA education programs when the Kennedy Report called for more tribal education. The 1949 Hoover Report sounds like this, with a one-sided push towards public education.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that they limit the bullet to schools that serve Native children to avoid this debate. Dr. Charleston remarked that this would work if we believe that there can be a joint effort between tribes and states. Dr. Demmert suggested the following wording, which was agreed to.

#3 Amended: *Allocate specific funding for schools serving Native children to develop and use linguistically,* *culturally, and developmentally appropriate curricula.*

(4) Enact legislation that implements Title I of P.L 101-477, the Native American Languages Act of October 30, 1990, in public schools.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy commented that states could be encouraged to enact the legislation. Dr. Charleston expressed his concern that this bullet was prohibiting the development of partnerships between tribes and states. Dr. Demmert said that the focus for this section is public schools because states cannot affect BIA schools.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if there was a description of the Native American Language Act anywhere in the report. Mr. Ely suggested that the appendix might be the place to put that. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy agreed, saying that maybe a footnote on it would be appropriate. Dr. Demmert said that the law would be easy to get a hold of. It is just like any statute or congressional record. Libraries that carry those type of documents would have it and it is readily available to anybody.

The bullet was accepted as drafted.

(5) Develop legislation, in partnership with universities and tribes, that allows tribal language, culture, and vocational experts to attain certification as classroom teachers once their competence as teachers has been documented.

Mr. Lewis asked who determines competence. Dr. Demmert answered that that needs to be determined, but perhaps it should be a partnership between tribes, universities, and the state.

The bullet was accepted as drafted.

(6) Require state departments of education to report annually on the progress schools are making towards improving academic progress and meeting the National Native Education Goals.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if states are required to track the progress of Native students. Dr. Demmert said that some states do and some do not. However, the federal government is moving in that direction. In Alaska, it made a significant difference when they had to report on the progress of Native students.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy said that what they needed were data on enrollment levels. Dr. White asked if they were looking at comparative data from one school to another. Dr. Demmert responded, saying data will vary between schools. Putting pressure on the school districts really made a difference in Alaska.

The bullet was accepted as drafted.

Recommendations for the federal government

(1) Declare as the nation's highest priority for services to American Indian and Alaska Native communities the improvement of schools that Native children attend and the improvement of the academic performance of Native children.

Accepted as drafted.

(2) Establish an Assistant Secretary for Indian Education in the U.S Department of Education to provide national direction and coordination for improving the quality of schools, colleges, and universities serving Native students.

  (2a) Authorize the Assistant Secretary to review all federal appropriations for the education of Native children and adults, and coordinate the establishment of priorities and Indian education related programs across the federal government.

  (2b) Authorize the Assistant Secretary to limit federal regulatory requirements when schools and universities develop comprehensive plans to improve the quality of education for Native students, and when those plans have been approved by the Assistant Secretary.

  (2c) Promote development of comprehensive plans by colleges, universities, and state and local educational agencies which incorporate the Indian Student Bill of Rights, and the National Goals for Native Education recommended by the Task Force.

  (2d) Authorize tribes, Native communities, and parents of Native children, in partnership with public and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, to participate in the development, implementation, and evaluation of local, state, and federal plans.

  (2e) Require approval by tribes, Native communities, and parents of local and state plans as a condition of approval by U.S. Department of Education for limiting rules, regulations and requirements of federal educational programs serving Native children and adults.

Mr. Ely asked if they really needed the sub-bullets. Dr. Demmert said that they did in order to provide direction for their suggestions.

Mr. Lewis expressed his concern with the BIA part of the bullet. He did not want to see money being taken away from public schools. Dr. Demmert said that the bullet should not affect state government. Mr. Lewis said that he did not want to lose money to BIA schools just because someone set new priorities at the federal level. Dr. Demmert stated his belief that if you want to provide funding for education as a higher priority, the only way to do that is to bring in the U.S. Department of Education. That is why we suggested forming the position of an Assistant Secretary. The BIA cannot do it alone.

Dr. Charleston commented that he would like to see more Impact Aid and less Title V money.

Dr. Demmert said that with an Assistant Secretary there could be some direction among people who make up the federal budgets that affect Indians, including the BIA. This, of course, depends on who the Assistant Secretary and President are.

Dr. Charleston asked why they did not also recommend including the tribes in the decision-making process. Dr. Demmert said that would be impossible in the larger setting of the federal budget, which was a process that was not about to change. The setting of the budget is a very closed process, and to influence the process you need someone at a high enough level who is sensitive to Native issues. Right now there is no one who speaks directly for Indian education at the highest levels during the budget process.

Mr. Hill asked what climate would be needed to create this position. Dr. Demmert said that it would only happen if the legislature feels strongly enough to create the position. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that it would be a good approach to speak directly to Congress as soon as the report comes out. Advocacy for funding goes through Congress and that might be a better place to put our energies than the executive branch.

Dr. Demmert said that the report is going to the Secretary of Education. Congress will probably do what the Secretary and the President want. The Indian community can influence Congress directly if it can organize itself around these issues. The truth, however, is that we will not get an Assistant Secretary and this is a rhetorical argument.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if the relegation of some points to sub-bullets would mean that they got less consideration than other items. Dr. Demmert replied that people should still say, "here is something that we can do even though we might not be able to meet all their requests." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked why they needed to be predicated by the request for an Assistant Secretary.

Dr. Beaulieu suggested that they should emphasize the sub-bullets as policy initiatives and then mention the Assistant Secretary as the person who could do all of these things.

Dr. Demmert said that he thought they needed to be specific about where this responsibility should lie and equate it with an Assistant Secretary position. Maybe we will not get the position, but some ideas will be pulled out and put in Title V when Congress reauthorizes it next year. By equating these policy initiatives with an Assistant Secretary it says that we want this to be done at a very high level. If we don't get the position, we can still fight to get the recommendations implemented.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that he understood what Dr. Demmert was saying, but he also saw Dr. Beaulieu's point. The way it is now it all seems to flow together and the different points seem to be dependent upon each other. I could see how some of these good recommendations could be ignored just because people see them as dependent on the creation of an Assistant Secretary. They should be made to read as if they stand alone.

Dr. Ginsburg asked if there were other recommendations that could affect the Assistant Secretary or if these were the full scope. If there are other things, you should mention the Assistant Secretary at the end.

Dr. Demmert asked if some of the sub-bullets could stand alone. Mr. Hill remarked that we are posturing to create the position, but we understand that we are not going to get it. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that some people think linearly and the multi-importance of issues are lost. We don't want some people to take it that way.

Mr. Fullerton said that the Task Force should recommend the establishment of the Assistant Secretary and then make the other recommendations as separate bullets. Dr. Beaulieu said they should place the sub-bullets first and then word a section on the Assistant Secretary that would encompass the bullets. These sub-bullets are the heart and soul of some of the recommendations. A comprehensive plan compels schools to define goals and encourages the federal government to make plans for students.

Dr. Demmert said that they could make the last three sub-bullets full bullets and then establish the Assistant Secretary with the first two sub-bullets remaining sub-bullets that describe the position.

Dr. Ginsburg asked what the second and third sub-bullets have to do with each other. They seemed so close that they could be merged. Dr. Beaulieu replied that the Task Force should keep them separate because what it was suggesting with the Assistant Secretary was so different than what was done before, it was important to keep the different sections clear.

Dr. Demmert agreed that as it reads now it suggests that without the Assistant Secretary the three bullets under it might be overlooked. They should be moved to the top in order to set them up as a priority.

Dr. Ginsburg recommended that the first sub-bullet be changed to read, "the Secretary of Education jointly with the Secretary of the Interior." Dr. Demmert thought that was a good idea that could be used with some of the other bullets as well.

Dr. Demmert suggested that they change the beginning of the first sub-bullet to say, "Require the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the Interior...." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that the two Secretaries should have to come up with a national plan. Dr. Ginsburg added that he would encourage them to come up with the plan and that they should add other departments such as Health and Human Services, which also have programs for Indians.

Dr. Demmert said that they should keep the bullet's focus on the Secretary of Education while also addressing the other Secretaries. Dr. Charleston emphasized that they should develop interdepartmental plans. Dr. Demmert then asked if they are addressing this to the Secretary of Education or Congress. Mr. Hill answered that they would do both. Dr. Ginsburg added that the problem with Congress is that there are so many different committees.

Dr. Demmert asked how they could word this for the Secretary of Education. Dr. Ginsburg suggested that they write, "the Secretary of Education, in coordination with other Secretaries...."

Mr. Hill thought that they should go to the Senate Select Committee with these recommendations first. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy commented that Congress was where the results were happening and the President was not doing anything. Dr. Charleston added that all federal programs beneficial to the Indian community came out of Congress.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy commented that some acts passed require reports on paper. This bullet might have more teeth if it was part of an enactment and not just a departmental program. How much can the Department of Education hope to do without legislation behind it, especially if it is costly? This is a little weak without the word "enact."

Dr. Charleston said that he would not want to see another report when they already had this one. Dr. Demmert remarked that this report was not the same kind of report Congress would be asking for. Congress would want an annual review. Dr. Ginsburg clarified that the annual review would look at progress and review the different programs.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that the money coming in for Indians was not changing year to year while the population was steadily increasing.

Dr. Demmert said that what they were looking for here was a high-level review of federal appropriations of programs for Native children. Dr. Charleston commented that they might want to ask for an enactment that establishes a comprehensive plan. Dr. Ginsburg responded that funding is one thing, but here we are trying to make a currently fragmented system work better so that it can use the available money more effectively. Dr. Demmert said they need to create a process for doing this in a more systematic way. We could propose legislation to coordinate all federal programs. Dr. Charleston explained that he did not want the Department of Education taking over the Bureau of Indian Affairs and he did not want the BIA moving into the Department's arena.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that what they were interested in doing was getting the participation of many different departments. In black colleges it has been effective to pull together divergent strands. Maybe we want an Executive Order that "examines, promotes, and coordinates...."

Dr. Charleston stated that an annual report feeds into the lack of data issue. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that maybe they need some language that will cause OERI to get the lead out. Without the word "enact," it will be difficult to get anything done. Dr. Demmert said that this was a report for the Secretary of Education. The Indian community can then go to Congress and say, "here is what we should do." The Secretary asked us for a report on problems and recommendations. We are setting the base for action. If the Secretary does not follow through people can say, "you are not doing this," and then try to push it through other means.

Dr. Charleston said that the third sub-bullet could be a separate bullet. Dr. Demmert said that the last three sub-bullets could now be regular bullets. However, the last three sub-bullets all address schools and the Department of Education and BIA programs. Therefore, I suggest we leave them as sub-categories because they are tied to the carrot. In order to waive federal rules and regulations we need a plan. We could even require the approval of tribes and Native communities.

Dr. Charleston asked what rules the Task Force wanted to waive and suggested that it might just be better to get rid of the rules themselves if they are not any good. Dr. Demmert said the goal was to get the federal government to come up with a plan and then to meet the goals set out in this plan. People on Capitol Hill are not used to waiving rules, so that is why they say "limit" in the second sub-bullet. The report addresses federal programs, tribes, and even parents; it is very radical. Dr. Ginsburg added that it should affect all services in the schools, not just federal money. Dr. Demmert remarked that it is a comprehensive plan.

Dr. Beaulieu said that what they were asking for would give Native educators a way of knowing what programs were going on across the country. Dr. Demmert reiterated that this was calling for a very radical approach to change--a lot like restructuring. The resulting changes were as follows:

#2 Amended:

- *In cooperation with appropriate Secretaries from other departments, undertake a joint annual review of all federal appropriations for the education of Native children and adults, and coordinate the establishment of priorities and Native education related programs across the federal government.*

- *Seek authorization to limit federal regulatory requirements when schools and universities develop comprehensive plans to improve the quality of education for Native students and when those plans have been approved by the Secretary.*

- *Promote development of comprehensive plans by colleges, universities, and state and local educational agencies which incorporate the Indian Student Bill of Rights, and the National Goals for Native Education recommended by the Task Force.*

- *Require public and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools to include the participation of tribes, Native communities, and parents of Native children in the development, implementation, and evaluation of local, state, and federal plans.*

- *Require approval by tribes, Native communities, and parents of local and state plans as a condition of approval by U.S. Department of Education for limiting rules, regulations and requirements of federal educational programs serving Native children and adults.*

- *Establish an Assistant Secretary for Indian Education in the U.S Department of Education to provide national direction and coordination for improving the quality of schools, colleges, and universities serving Native students.*

Dr. Demmert asked Mr. Ely to review the last few pages of the report to see if he had any suggestions, since he would not be attending the second day of meetings. Mr. Ely said that he thought the report was well put together in terms of priorities. He wanted recommendations for the tribal government to be left so that the first bullet remained as the first bullet.

At 5:55 pm Dr. Demmert adjourned the meeting.

Tuesday, June 11, 1991 - Morning Session

Dr. Demmert called the meeting to order at 9:15 am. He suggested that the Task Force pick up where it left off and go directly to the Recommendations section of the final report.

Recommendations for the federal government (continued)

(3) Support early childhood education, prenatal care, and parenting programs that are linguistically, culturally, and developmentally appropriate for Native children in every American Indian reservation and Alaska Native community.

Accepted as drafted.

(4) Require federal programs providing social services to Natives to develop partnerships with tribal groups and with schools serving Native children. These partnerships will give the highest priority to prenatal care, parenting and early childhood education, as well as health care for expectant mothers and young children.

Accepted as drafted.

(5) Authorize the establishment of a national research and school improvement center for Native education. The center will serve as a resource center for schools educating Native children, for tribes, for state departments of education, for universities, and as a source of funding for research designed to improve education programs and academic achievement of Native students.

Dr. Demmert reminded the Task Force that they purposely left this paragraph open-ended in its meaning.

Mr. Hill asked if the national research and school improvement center would fall under the authority of the Assistant Secretary of Education that the Task Force wanted to create. Dr. Demmert explained that the center would not necessarily fall under the Assistant Secretary or be reliant on the creation of such a position. In fact, the center could be in any number of departments, such as OERI.

(6) Amend Title V (The Indian Education Act of 1972 as amended) to provide long-term discretionary funding for model projects designed to improve schools and academic performance of Native students.

Dr. Tippeconnic said that he liked the bullet as it was written. Dr. Ginsburg suggested that the Task Force might want to add to this bullet something that called for rigorous evaluations of existing programs. Dr. Tippeconnic responded, saying that his department already has the authority to do some evaluation projects. I have research and survey authority, as well as the authority to implement innovative and effective practices. I believe, however, that more emphasis needs to be placed on adult education.

Dr. Demmert agreed and suggested adding a clause that called on the Department of Education to develop plans to deal with adult illiteracy. Mr. Hill agreed that the Department needed to take a more active role in attacking Native adult illiteracy and asked Dr. Ginsburg if the Department already had money to tackle adult illiteracy. Dr. Ginsburg said it did.

Dr. Demmert suggested they add a bullet on adult illiteracy and the need for increased funding. Dr. Ginsburg agreed, adding that the bullet should also call for an assessment of the state of adult illiteracy in the Native community.

Dr. Demmert and Dr. Ginsburg suggested they add the following bullet under the bullet on Title V: "Assess the extent of adult illiteracy in the Indian community, review the adequacy of current funding and programs addressing illiteracy, and develop a plan to eliminate illiteracy in the adult population."

Returning to the previous bullet, Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested they remove the parentheses. Dr. Demmert agreed that was a good suggestion and then recommended that they put the parentheses around "Title V" and add a clause so that the bullet would now read:

#6 Amended: *Amend the Indian Education Act of 1972 as amended (Title V) to provide long-term discretionary funding for model projects and outreach activities for Native parents and students designed to improve schools and academic performance of Native Students.*

The Task Force agreed to these changes.

(7) Create a national information center to collect and distribute information on educational technology and programs that use technology for improving schools and learning.

Dr. White noted that the ideas contained in the recommendation were right in line with President Bush's America 2000 goals.

Dr. Demmert suggested that they add a bullet that secured funds in the TRIO program that would ensure increased access for Native students to higher education and Indian colleges. Dr. Ginsburg noted that now only TRIO programs that currently have funding can get it. Mr. Hill recommended that they set a 10 percent bottom line for the set-aside or not bother adding the bullet. The specific wording of this bullet was left to be worked out by Dr. Demmert.

(8) Amend the Bilingual Education Act to allow for the retention and continued development of Native languages in accordance with Title I of P.L. 101-477, the Native American Language Act of October 30, 1990.

Accepted as drafted.

(9) Provide for a system of independent evaluation and dissemination of programs and projects shown to be effective.

Accepted as drafted.

(10) Create an Indian higher education set-aside in the Oil and Mineral Act (Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service) to provide student fellowships for higher education.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Ginsburg if they could get a better citing for the Oil and Mineral Act and Dr. Ginsburg assured him that they could.

The bullet was accepted as drafted.

(11) Require the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Education to develop specific plans and programs to increase the numbers of American Indian and Alaska Native students attending and graduating from our nation's colleges and universities.

Dr. Beaulieu commented that tribes have eliminated scholarships and that many Native students, especially those off the reservations, do not have many funding options. Dr. Demmert commented that Indians have difficulty paying back loans. Dr. Beaulieu added that the real issue is that there is not enough money. Dr. Demmert noted that the need for more funding is addressed in the letter of transmittal.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that the Task Force needed to ask the BIA how many people are not funded. The waiting lists seem extremely long and growing, but there are no numbers to show that.

Mr. Hill remarked that he wanted to ensure that the money would be available for students who need it. Dr. Demmert expressed his opinion that it would be better to have a separate scholarship program set up so that the federal government would not just reallocate the money that was already assigned to the Office of Indian Education. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy agreed that financial support for students was the key to this bullet.

Dr. Demmert suggested to reword the bullet as follows:

#11 Amended: *Assess the unmet higher education, financial, and academic needs of Indian students and coordinate the development of specific plans, programs, and budgets to increase the numbers of American Indian and Alaska Native students attending and graduating from our nation's colleges and universities.*

The Task Force accepted this change.

(12) Promote the training of Native educators for elementary, secondary, and university teaching as a national priority.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that they change the word "university" to "postsecondary." Mr. Hill added that they might want to add the words "increase funding to" before the beginning of this bullet. That change was agreed to.

#12 Amended: *Increase funding to promote the training of Native educators for elementary, secondary, and university teaching as a national priority.*

(13) Promote the training of American Native professionals in science, mathematics, law, engineering, medicine, business, the social sciences and related fields as a national priority.

Mr. Hill again suggested that they insert the words "increase funding to" at the beginning. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested they remove the word professionals. Both suggestions were agreed to.

#13 Amended: *Increase funding to promote the training of American Natives in science, mathematics, law, engineering, medicine, business, the social sciences and related fields as a national priority.*

(14) Fully implement P.L. 95-561, Title XI of the Education Amendments Act of 1978, which promoted Indian self-determination, stating that it *shall be the policy of the Bureau [of Indian Affairs], in carrying out the functions of the Bureau, to facilitate Indian control of Indian affairs in all matters relating to education.*

Dr. Demmert suggested that the last phrase be removed and simplified to read, "Fully implement P.L. 95-561...which enables Indian governance of BIA schools." Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that "control" was a better word than "governance." The Task Force agreed to these changes.

#14 Amended: *Fully implement P.L. 95-561, Title XI of the Education Amendments Act of 1978, which enables Indian control of BIA schools.*

(15) Provide incentives for schools that develop exemplary program outreach activities for Native parents and students.

Dr. Demmert commented that this bullet contained an idea that they already had added in other areas. He recommended that they omit this bullet and the Task Force agreed. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy argued that outreach to parents was an especially important element of developing good programs. Dr. Demmert explained that they added it to the bullet about Title V.

(16) Ensure equity in funding for school facilities and school operations in all federal and public school districts across the respective states that serve Native students.

Dr. Demmert noted that they should emphasize the need to develop legislation. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked why they could not do that now through Impact Aid.

Mr. Fullerton asked how the federal government would implement this bullet. Dr. Demmert explained that now every LEA has its own plan and that the bullet calls for BIA schools to come up with a plan for construction and programs in their own schools.

Mr. Fullerton believed the idea was good, but thought that the Task Force should not become involved with the prerogatives of state governments. Telling the states to do something is impossible. Dr. Demmert responded, saying he felt the idea was to get the federal government to take a proactive stance on funding. Mr. Fullerton said that what the bullet was really asking for was to take money from the rich LEAs and give it to poor ones. Dr. Demmert responded that states needed to address the needs of Indian students, and Indian students are in the poorest areas. I did not want to say that the federal government should restructure all of the states funding systems.

Dr. Ginsburg offered his opinion that this bullet was only really referring to the BIA and that should be made clear. I recommend that the rewording focus on equity in funding and efficiency, emphasizing the federal government's special responsibility to special types of children. I also suggest they limit the bullet to districts receiving P.L. 874 money. Dr. Demmert agreed and added that they should limit it to all schools receiving federal Impact Aid and/or BIA money. There is a lot of congressional support for improving school facilities.

Dr. White repeated that equity was a good idea, but rich states may see this as a "Robin Hood" idea and be wary of it. Dr. Demmert said that they had to address the inequity between states in this report. Mr. Fullerton responded, saying he did not think it was a bad idea, but once you start talking about restructuring tax formulas you are walking on dangerous ground. Dr. Demmert again emphasized that they were only talking about BIA and Impact Aid schools. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that if they backed away from the equity issue they might as well throw away the report.

Dr. Demmert said there were three key aspects to this bullet: (1) we have to narrow the perspective to just Natives, (2) we need to have the equity piece, and (3) we need to cover Dr. Ginsburg's political concern. How do we get the Secretary of Education and the Office of Management and Budget to look at this? We need a piece on efficiency without saying you are inefficient. Dr. Demmert suggested the following revisions to the bullet: "Develop legislation to ensure equity in funding for school facilities and operations and to improve the effectiveness of BIA and Impact Aid schools serving Native students." The changes were agreed to.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy stated that funding for tribally controlled colleges is needed and that Native American community colleges rank 51st in funding. She suggested adding the following bullet, which was agreed to: "Provide equity in funding for facilities and operations for tribally controlled colleges that meet national per-pupil expenditure averages for community colleges."

Added: *Ensure equity in funding for school facilities and school operations in all federal and public school districts across the respective states that serve Native students.*

Recommendations for colleges and universities

(1) Honor legal and moral responsibilities to American Indian and Alaska Native communities by developing partnerships to strengthen technical and professional qualifications of Native students.

Mr. Fullerton asked for clarifications on what moral responsibilities they were referring to in this bullet. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy responded that higher education institutions are responsive to that kind of language and would feel their responsibility to the Native community. Dr. Beaulieu added that universities have a broad idea of responsibility to the community, but he did not quite understand what "legal and moral responsibilities" referred to here. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy noted that many universities claim to serve an area or a state, but there are usually big gaps when it comes to the reservations. Dr. Beaulieu suggested that they drop the part about moral and legal responsibilities and keep the rest of the bullet.

Dr. Charleston emphasized that he would like to see a call for more scholarship and fellowship programs in this bullet. Mr. Hill said that the issue was broader than scholarships and it should be kept in mind that none of these universities are honorable when it comes to dealing with Native issues. Dr. Demmert suggested the following changes, which were agreed to.

#1 Amended: *Institutionalize funding programs for students and faculty for Indian students designed to strengthen technical and professional capabilities of Native communities.*

(2) Revise teacher training programs to prepare teachers to work within a multicultural setting that supports and challenges students from diverse cultures.

Dr. Demmert suggested that they change "teachers" to "educators," which was agreed upon.

#2 Amended: *Revise teacher training programs to prepare educators to work within a multicultural setting that supports and challenges students from diverse cultures.*

(3) Recruit and hire American Indian and Alaska Native faculty both to serve as role models and to provide additional perspectives that are not present in current courses of study.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy proposed that they should add "develop" and "retain" to the sentence and that the second part was unnecessary. These changes were agreed to.

#3 Amended: *Develop, recruit, hire, and retain American Indian and Alaska Native faculty.*

(4) Encourage scholarly work on curricula and textbook development that incorporate Native perspectives.

Accepted as drafted.

(5) Develop partnerships with school districts to improve local education.

Accepted as drafted.

(6) Develop partnerships with Native communities to provide technical assistance, train professionals, and address research questions important to the communities.

Dr. Beaulieu commented that this bullet addressed technical assistance, which he wanted in the report. The Task Force accepted the bullet as drafted.

Conclusion

Dr. Demmert then suggested that the Task Force move onto the conclusion and make any changes. Dr. Demmert read the conclusion and asked for comments, noting that he liked the content of the conclusion, but that it did not flow well.

Dr. Charleston recommended that they not use the word "heritage" so often. He explained that the word elicits connotations of being static and past tense. We should not echo mainstream society's view of Indians. It is not heritage, it is our life now. The Choctaw are the Choctaw of today, not the Choctaw of 1520.

Dr. Beaulieu stated that he wanted to see a transition that stated that it was the Task Force's belief that the country needs to recognize Native culture in order to have effective schools. Recognition of the uniqueness of Indian children will enable us to do the things we need to do to become effective. We need an overpowering statement saying the country must recognize these cultures.

Mr. Hill said he would like to see more on the importance of ensuring the survival of the Indian Nations. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy showed him that there was a quote on that topic on another page that they might want to move closer to the conclusion.

Letter of transmittal

Dr. Demmert asked the Task Force to turn to the letter of transmittal.

Dr. Charleston noted that they planned to print the Native education goals on the back of the inside cover. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy suggested that paragraph seven would be a good place to add something on the unique nature of Indians and the need to meet their special cultural and academic needs.

Dr. Beaulieu stated that the Task Force should add that if the nation could resolve the issues facing Native Americans, it would be better equipped to meet the large number of cultural issues facing it around the world. The United States' global situation would be enhanced by doing something positive for Native students.

Dr. Demmert asked if he meant that by having the United States meet the challenge of helping Native Americans, other nations will similarly develop strategies to meet the needs of their Native peoples and ethnic minorities. Dr. Beaulieu said that was fairly accurate. The changes they made are as follows:

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force presents the following report Indian Nations At Risk: The First 500 Years as part of a national effort to improve the quality of education for America's students. While this effort predates America 2000, its call for a comprehensive transformation of Indian education parallels the strategies you propose for the entire Nation.

The Task Force believes that this report, specifically addressing the education needs of Native America (American Indians and Alaskan Natives), will make a significant improvement in the academic performance levels of Native students if fully implemented.

The Task Force identified four important reasons Indian Nations are at risk as a people. First, schools have failed to educate large numbers of Indian students and adults; second, the language and cultural base of the American Native is rapidly eroding; third, the diminishing lands and natural resources of the American Native are constantly under siege; and fourth, Indian self-determination and governance rights are constantly challenged by the changing philosophies of the administration, Congress, and the court systems.

The Task Force believes that a well educated Indian citizenry and a renewal of the language and cultural base of the American Native community will strengthen self-determination and the economic well being. In addition, it will allow the Native community to contribute to building a stronger America. An America that is competitive in the economic, political, cultural, and educational environments of today's world.

The report summarizes the major educational findings reported in the Native testimony; recommends seven major research-based strategies for addressing educational needs; and presents a set of recommendations that are comprehensive in nature, but responsive to the complexities of improving schools and schooling.

This report recommends a comprehensive education strategy to improve the quality of education for Native Americans. It is a model of what can be done for the entire Nation. Basic to this strategy is the need to join partnership with parents, school officials, tribal leaders, and policymakers. Each of us has a critical role. The Task Force calls on you to exercise your leadership as Secretary of Education to guide this initiative.

The Task Force urges you to implement those recommendations that you have the authority to adopt; to recommend to the United States Congress specific legislation for those recommendations that will require additional authority; and to propose budget increases for several priority areas. This would include but not be limited to new early childhood education and parenting programs; teacher education, and other professional training for larger numbers of Indian students and adults; Indian community colleges; and the development of new and exemplary education projects that are designed to meet the unique cultural and academic needs of Native students.

We believe the report is accurate in its presentation of the current status of American Native Education; that it captures the essence of what the research and the American Native community has identified as necessary to improve schools; and that the recommendations are sound. We accepted our appointments and tasks seriously and welcome the opportunity to work with you as you move forward with the recommendations.

Dr. Demmert then broke the meeting at 11:20 am to move to another room.

Tuesday, June 11, 1991 - Morning Session - Continued

Commissioned papers and supplementary chapters

Dr. Demmert called the meeting back to order at 11:30 am in the conference room of ED, room 4079. Dr. Demmert reminded the Task Force that Mr. Ely had asked yesterday that they address Chapter One of the large document. Mr. Ely had stated that he believed the chapter still contained a good deal of verbiage from Mike Charleston's first draft of the final report, which the Task Force had decided was too inflammatory. The Task Force should consider how it wants to publish the documents, as one large document or as separate pieces.

Dr. Charleston suggested that they make the documents available through the ERIC system and at the Arizona State Library as separate documents. He added that as a whole, the document serves as a significant resource for Native education and that it should be presented as a whole.

Dr. Demmert reminded everyone that they only have a limited amount of money to publish the report and its supporting documents. Dr. Ginsburg said that he believed someone should have the option to order one part of the report without having to order 700 pages of documents. Dr. Charleston recommended that they print it both as one volume and as separate documents.

Mr. Lewis reiterated Mr. Ely's previous comments about Chapter One of the large document, saying Mr. Ely found the document too inflammatory. Dr. Demmert thought Mr. Ely's problem was that Chapter One was too much like the rejected early drafts.

Dr. Charleston described the chapter, saying that it still contained the material on pseudo- and quasi-education, sections on Native assimilation, and the industrial school model.

Dr. Demmert said that he believed the chapter to be fine so long as it stood as an independent document. If it was part of the report then everyone on the Task Force would need to agree on the material that the chapter contained. Dr. Charleston offered to let someone clean up the chapter but felt that he would be unable to change his own writing to suit everyone's taste. Mr. Hill commented that he found the group editing process extremely difficult as everyone has his or her own way of saying things.

Dr. Charleston claimed that a number of the supporting documents are not consistent with the final report. My piece is an introduction to a volume of documents and it was not commissioned. My chapter, Dr. Beaulieu's chapter on change, and the description and summary of the hearings were all uncommissioned pieces. Dr. Beaulieu clarified that his piece was commissioned.

Dr. Demmert said that the report is a product of the Task Force and has already gone through two revisions and still is not finished. The commissioned papers have already been submitted and if the Task Force wants to change them, it can revise them or ask the authors to make the revisions. Dr. Charleston said that the contracts on the commissioned papers were closed and that it was too late to make any revisions to them.

Dr. Demmert asked the Task Force how they wanted to present the commissioned papers. He suggested that they be considered an addendum to the report, but in order to do that they would need to be comfortable with the contents of the papers. We can also make them an independent document. Mr. Hill reemphasized the point that, in either case, the Task Force should not edit the papers.

Mr. Hill then voiced his opinion that it was a shame Dr. Charleston did not want his name on the report since he had done such hard work.

Dr. Charleston responded by saying he respected Mr. Ely and Dr. Demmert's criticisms of his writing and that he understood it was just a difference of opinion on what the content and philosophy of the final document should contain. There are many different perspectives on what Native education should look like. I do not concur with all the different parts of the final report, but I do whole-heartedly support other parts. I understand that Mr. Ely and others do not agree with parts of my writing and I do not want to impose my ideas on the Task Force. I support the report and the work of the Task Force, although I do not agree with large parts of it.

Dr. Demmert reiterated that the report was the Task Force's document and that it should not go out until the Task Force agreed to it. Again, should the papers stand alone or should they be considered a product of the Task Force? Dr. Charleston responded, arguing that it would be unethical to change the papers as they were written for the public record. Dr. Demmert offered the idea that they just put a disclaimer on the commissioned papers.

Dr. Charleston stated that he believed it was important to show all the different positions people have taken on Indian education. He noted that his piece fell under the auspices of the Task Force and since he worked for the Task Force, his piece should be edited to accommodate the opinions of the Task Force. Dr. Charleston suggested that they replace his chapter with Chapter Two, which was more descriptive.

Dr. Demmert reiterated that if the Task Force wanted an introduction written by one of the staff members, it would need to be approved by the entire Task Force. Mr. Hill asked if Mr. Ely's concerns with Chapter One were supported by other Task Force members. Dr. Charleston declared that he would not defend his piece one way or the other and did not want to force it on the Task Force

Mr. Fullerton then asked Dr. Charleston why he would not put his name on the report. Dr. Charleston responded by saying he disagreed with basic elements of the report. He emphasized his belief that tribal control over education was better than publicly run schools. He said that while he supported the efforts of the Task Force, he could not support the parts of the report that called for more public education of Native students.

Mr. Fullerton then asked if Dr. Charleston was using Chapter One to put in his opinions that were left out of the report. Dr. Charleston said that he was not. I wrote the chapter in December and it later evolved into the early draft which was rejected by the Task Force. I concur with Mr. Ely that the Task Force had already decided not to include many of the opinions expressed in the chapter.

Mr. Fullerton stated that he wanted Dr. Charleston's name on the report and that everyone had to compromise during the process. Dr. Charleston has done good work for the Task Force and he is an integral part of it. Furthermore, I fear that by withholding his name, Dr. Charleston might undermine the report. I do not believe that he should have gone along with the project all year and then decide he is not a part of it at the end. I hope the report does not put Dr. Charleston in a hypocritical situation, but I see a danger that the report could become a minority opinion of the Task Force.

Dr. Charleston stated that he believed his influence to be minimal because he was not an official member of the Task Force. Mr. Fullerton responded by saying that Dr. Charleston's position was similar to Dr. Ginsburg's. A united front is important because a fractured report ruins the effectiveness.

Dr. Beaulieu stated that the Task Force was responsible for the content of the report and the staff's job was to put the report together. I believe the Task Force had come to conclusions and that the staff's responsibility was to represent the Task Force's interests as much as possible. Dr. Charleston concurred, stating he saw his task as a technical one of putting the report together.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy described what she saw as the two parts to the report. The report itself is one, and the process is another. Dr. Charleston's name should be on the report because his leadership distinguished what we did and is a part of the process. However, it is his choice whether or not to put it on, keeping in mind that we all have a sense of give and take and that it would be tragic not to have his name on it.

Mr. Lewis reiterated the point that no one was completely satisfied with the report because everyone compromised. The report does not go far enough, but it does set the stage for further developments. Mr. Lewis stated his belief that they and others could work from this beginning. Dr. Charleston has no choice but to put his name on the report because he was a part of the process. I suggest that the Task Force vote as to what we should do with Chapter One.

Dr. Demmert stated that the report was a Task Force report and Task Force members' names would be on it. The co-chairs would sign the report. Whether the names of the staff members should be on the report is open to discussion. Dr. Charleston agreed that the decision belonged to the Task Force. Dr. Demmert said that Dr. Charleston's name as a staff member does not signify support for the report. On the other hand, the Task Force members feel that they have made acceptable compromises and they plan to put their names on the report.

Dr. Charleston stated that Wilma Robinson had expressed her desire to sign the report. Dr. Demmert said that Ivan Sidney was the only member of the Task Force who had not indicated whether or not he would sign the report. Other than that there is unanimity, and the Task Force seems to want to list staff members, including Dr. Ginsburg.

Dr. Charleston reminded the Task Force that he works on educational issues facing Natives for a living and that he disapproves of the bureaucracy that the report has been placed under. Dr. Demmert reiterated that Dr. Charleston's job is to produce a report that reflects the vision of the Task Force. Dr. Charleston, Dr. Ginsburg, and Gaye Leia King have all been very responsive and made the process considerably more pleasant. I suggest that we move on to decide what to do with Chapter One.

Dr. Charleston stated that the chapter was an early summary of thoughts and that few changes had been made to it since he initially wrote it. Dr. Demmert and Mr. Hill asked if he would be willing to change it. Dr. Charleston claimed that he did not believe it would be worthwhile to edit it as he would not be able to make it consistent with the final report.

Dr. Demmert then asked if he would be willing to reorganize Chapter Two and make it into Chapter One by integrating the testimony. Dr. Charleston indicated that this would be acceptable.

Mr. Hill brought up another concern of Mr. Ely's regarding the quotes and graphs. Dr. Demmert said that they planned to leave them in the report, possibly revising and shortening some of the quotes.

Mr. Hill reiterated the concerns that the research sample was too small and that he would like to see more science and math graphics as well as a disclaimer. Dr. Ginsburg said that they had a new NAEP study with similar pieces of information. Dr. Demmert said that he would review all the charts and make final decisions on whether to keep them or not. Dr. Ginsburg stated his belief that the press would still be able to use the graphs as a focal point as long as there was a disclaimer.

Mr. Hill suggested that they release the report at an Indian school. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy added that many colleges have summer sessions. Dr. Demmert said that they would try to find an acceptable date that they could all work their schedules around. He then asked Dr. Ginsburg how long it would take to print the report. Dr. Ginsburg said that, by law, they had to take it to the Government Printing Office (GPO) and that takes a couple of weeks. However, if there is a window of opportunity, we can xerox the report. The GPO could have the report ready by late July or early August.

Mr. Hill suggested taking advantage of the energy generated when schools begin in the fall. Dr. Demmert added that the end of a legislative session was another good time. The key is to generate good press.

Additional sections of the report

Dr. Demmert then stated that there were two more pieces of the report to address. The first is Dr. Beaulieu's rewrite and the second is Mr. Lewis's. I did not like the first, but find Mr. Lewis's piece appropriate. Mr. Lewis noted that he already had some changes to his piece.

Dr. Demmert asked the Task Force to turn to page 25 of the edited version he had handed them today. Dr. Beaulieu stated that his intention was to highlight the idea that Natives had made significant progress with an unprecedented amount of activity, but that problems still remain; these efforts were not effecting solutions.

Dr. Demmert asked Dr. Beaulieu if he could rework the section to make it clearer. Dr. Beaulieu then asked the Task Force if they thought his idea was on the right track. Dr. Demmert answered, saying he thought the ideas were important. They then went on to examine Mr. Lewis's piece on page 29 of the edited version.

Mr. Lewis read the section that he had written and the Task Force recommended minor grammatical and word choice changes as he went. After these changes, the piece read as follows:

> *It is important to recognize that research related to the education of Alaska Natives/American Indian children is scant. In addition, much of the research and available data is poor in quality and is generally focused upon specific local or regional issues. However, the Task Force has been able to review and use data and materials available from current American Indian sources such as the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.*
>
> *Although much of the educational evaluation research is applicable to other populations of the United States a great deal of the important research is on-going nationally which bears upon the changing paradigms of education in the United States must be supported in this report. This research represents opportunities for application for the improvement of educational conditions for American Native children.*
>
> *It is evident that the existing educational systems have largely failed to educate and prepare American Native children. Nor have these systems, whether they be public or federal, effectively been able to meet the other educational, cultural, tribal economic and social needs of tribal communities.*
>
> *Important aspects of current research relate directly to educational system change, the development of educational renewal and restructuring models, alternative assessment methodologies, educational leadership and strategies for the improvement of teaching and learning. This research along with the practices that derive from them, must be used to maximize efforts by tribal leaders, educational policy makers and educators to strengthen the education systems serving Native students.*
>
> *The Task Force has focused upon seven important concerns that must be supported to improve educational practices and opportunities.*

Mr. Lewis continued by stating his goal was to encourage a model that trusted local schools to educate the students. This handout can be used to create the bullets for the new section entitled "Systems Change and Educational Leadership." Dr. Demmert reminded Mr. Lewis that the information has to be supported by research findings. Mr. Lewis responded, saying that research findings did support the general idea of giving the schools more control to make decisions, but that there are a number of effective models that fall under school autonomy.

Dr. Demmert emphasized that the Task Force's recommendations allow these changes to happen. He also asked if the idea of changing the words "system change" to "systemic change" was a good one. Ms. Pease-Windy

Boy supported that idea and also recommended changing the wording on page 33.

Mr. Lewis gave an explanation of his handout, entitled "Research Findings for Educational Systems-Restructuring and Leadership." He explained that much of the information came from Levin's Accelerated Schools and other parts came from Essential Schools and the Relearning process. Many of these ideas drive the Educational Commission of States and America 2000. Mr. Lewis's handout is as follows:

1. *Accountability. Educational systems (Federal-BIA and public) must be made accountable to the present needs of all children.*

2. *Educational improvement must be tied to local and community control which relies upon local initiative in partnership with state and federal initiatives for support and resources.*

3. *School reform must occur at the school and community levels in order to develop a sense of ownership and responsibility.*

4. *Successful school and educational system reform must extend beyond the school to actively include parents and tribal communities so that a higher priority is set upon learning.*

5. *There must be a redesign of the educational systems serving Indian populations in order that such systems become more responsive and accountable to the needs of all children.*

6. *Educational changes and improvement take time and must be developed from the visions, needs and experiences of each school and community.*

7. *Educational systems serving Indian populations must use all available resources to consider models that represent change processes that trust what people know about and have experienced.*

8. *Educational change and support cannot be successfully accomplished in isolation, but rather must include the total system building from the school and community base.*

9. *There are no quick fixes or prescribed methods that bring lasting educational change and improvement.*

10. *The educational change process is complicated, political, and risky. However, if we are to truly respond to the needs of children, tribal communities and schools must become motivated to do what is necessary.*

11. *It is necessary to build partnerships and resource networks of support so that system changes may be accomplished.*

12. *There must be adequate funds available which will allow networking among people so that thoughtful consideration and decisions may be made in determining what changes must be made to build accountability, educational services improvement and responsibility for school and educational improvement.*

The issue of accountability (issue number one) is a major point and one of the keys to restructuring. The second and eighth points emphasize the idea that change cannot be done in isolation. School change involves the community, the school, the state government, and the federal government. In New Mexico, changes did not happen in the schools alone without affecting other systems. The idea of "from the school house to the state house" is especially relevant here. We all have to work under the overlay of a bureaucracy. The third point relates to research and a change in the paradigm. What does education really mean and what are your perceptions of it? The sixth point gets at the idea that there are no quick fixes and that change is usually messy and complicated. The bureaucracy and politics will make change difficult, but we need the determination to move forward. Number seven works on the concept that research and current practices are not necessarily the only way to do things--we can trust what we know and use that to guide us. Number nine ties into number six, in that research must be well examined. If we assume that we know the answers to educational problems, accountability and responsibility are removed, which in turn leads to complacency. The eleventh point encourages educators to rely on other resources and avoid working in isolation. The last point emphasizes the need for money. You are not throwing money in the same old hole if you are restructuring. However, you have to buy the time of teachers, parents, and experts. You need to spend strategically.

We need to set an agenda, defining our own needs, then others will be more apt to assist us. It can be done, but it needs work.

Dr. Demmert emphasized the importance of enhancing the sense of teacher accomplishment as another possible point. I will take this list to see what is supported by research and if there needs to be any language changes.

Dr. Ginsburg said that he would like to see some of Mr. Lewis's ideas in the letter of transmittal. We need to emphasize the idea that people need to recognize that change is a long-term process.

Dr. White warned the Task Force that many administrators are very wary of school restructuring. It is important to address outcomes when talking about restructuring. Change just for the sake of change is an unsupported idea. We need to tie in student outcomes, because that is a key element.

Concluding discussion

Dr. Demmert then asked the Task Force if there was any other business. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy reminded the Task Force that they had not finalized their decisions as to where to insert librarian issues into the final report. If they want to do a good job on the report, a reference to librarians should be present in every section of the report. Dr. Demmert said he would look into her suggestion and see where research was available to legitimize inserting more sentences on librarians.

Dr. Ginsburg then brought up the issue of school choice. Dr. Charleston restated his belief that parents need to hold schools accountable and that if the school is not doing a good job, they should move their child. On another point, I am concerned that emphasizing the need for time to change things causes their urgency to be ignored. In 1927 and in 1963 we had reports saying change was necessary, but we did not see anything happen. Mr. Lewis responded by saying he did not mean to allow that much time. Dr. Charleston continued by emphasizing the need for parents to take action. They must recognize that the school is a problem and then make a proactive decision.

Dr. Demmert suggested adding a bullet under the Recommendations for state and local governments that read: "Provide alternative educational opportunities through model schools, magnet schools, or other schools designed to meet the unique language and cultural needs of Native students." I have a problem with the idea of opening up school systems to choice.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy voiced her opinion that often parents have to choose between horrible options, so there is no real choice. Mr. Lewis said there were two different issues: (1) the opportunity to create new schools and (2) the choice of sending a child to another school.

Dr. Demmert voiced his opinion that the choice issue was important and that they should keep tribal schools, such as those found in Minnesota, in mind. He then asked Dr. Beaulieu if he would try to word a new bullet on the topic.

The Task Force then turned again to Dr. Beaulieu's piece in the section, "Twenty Years of Progress." Dr. Beaulieu suggested that he could rework the piece and asked about the accuracy of the idea that despite 20 years of progress and improved programs, Native education still had serious problems remaining. From this starting point I tried to draw the conclusion that more funding was needed. The Task Force agreed that the idea was good and that he should rewrite the piece.

Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if he had included the development of tribally controlled colleges as part of the progress. Dr. Beaulieu said that he had not and that would make a good bullet for the progress section. Dr. Charleston added that the issue of control was an important one and tribally controlled public schools was another area of progress. It was decided that a bullet would be written on the increase of Indian-controlled schools.

Mr. Lewis then reminded the Task Force that they had agreed to remove the reference to the Lumbee Tribe, as it was unnecessary and some people have questioned the Lumbees' standing as a tribe at all.

Dr. Ginsburg asked the Task Force what they planned to do about a title. Dr. Demmert read some possible titles. Dr. Beaulieu said he liked The Next 500 Years: An Imperative for Educational Reform, saying it fit in well with a number of other events planned for 1992. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy agreed that was a good title. Dr. Tippeconnic added that the idea of looking forward instead of backwards was good.

Dr. Demmert informed the Task Force that a wordsmith would look at the letter of transmittal and the report itself. Ms. Pease-Windy Boy asked if they wanted a one-page summary of the commissioned papers somewhere in the report. Dr. Ginsburg suggested they just have the titles, which would not take up much room. Dr. Demmert said it could be part of the bibliography.

Dr. Demmert then asked the Task Force if they had any parting words. Dr. Beaulieu stated that he felt the last couple of days had been good. Dr. Ginsburg mentioned that he thought there should be a final sign-off on the report once the changes had been made. Dr. Demmert told the Task Force that they would send the report out in its final form, not expecting people to comment on it unless there was a mistake or an agreed-upon change had not been made.

Dr. Charleston mentioned that the front cover would stay the same, although it would be clearer once they used the computer to print it. Dr. Tippeconnic asked what the dissemination plan was. Dr. Ginsburg said they planned to print 10,000 copies of the report at first and 500 copies of the commissioned papers. Dr. Beaulieu said they should also get it into the ERIC system immediately. Dr. Demmert stated that they would be able to break down all the documents into its smaller pieces, including the summaries and original papers.

Dr. Demmert then said that he enjoyed working with everyone and that he expected to see them all at the release of the report. He then adjourned the meeting at 1:15 pm.